4103.b.59.

A IVST DEFENCE OF THE IMPORTUNATE BEGGERS IMPORTUNITY.

Or a Reply to Mr. NORRICE his Pamphlet upon the Fourth Petition, which hee set forth by way of Confutation of absolute praying unto God for Temporall necessary Blessings, &c. Defended in a Booke Intituled, *The Importunate Begger.*

Wherein the Truth of those Points concerning Praying to God for necessary Temporall things, without doubting and wavering &c.

Is againe Vindicated and Defended, By R. B.

But seeke yee first the Kingdome of God, and His righteousnesse, and all these things shall bee ministred vnto you. Matth. 6. 33.
Wherefore are yee fearefull, O yee of little faith, Matth. 8. 26.

Printed in the Yeere 1636.

BRITISH

TO

The Well-diſpoſed Reader.

CHRISTIAN Reader, it is true, that about Seven yeeres ſithence I taught in the Weſterne parts, and made it appeare by the Word of God, *That the Saints are to pray for Temporall promiſes in as abſolute a manner, as for Spirituall*; That is (as I explained my ſelfe) they are to pray as abſolutely for their daily bread, as for the pardon of ſinne, it being eqnally commanded to be asked, and the promiſes equally abſolute, *all being in Chriſt Ieſus, yea and Amen.*

Whence I concluded, that the cauſe was in our ſelues, if wee did not obtaine it. Whereupon divers (lying vnder Gods punniſhing hand) were offended, and queſtionleſſe much diſquietted, as not being able well to endure to haue their wounds ſearched to the bottome. A man that delt plainely with them, and told them, that ſuch, or ſuch an affliction which they lay under, came from God, and that for their ſinne, and that the beſt remedy was to ſearch out the evill, to repent and beleeue: A man (I ſay) that dealt thus with them, was accounted little better then *an enemie, tho' hee told them the Truth.* This (ſay they) will too much diſquiet the conſcience, for they are harſh poſitions, and worſe concluſions.

To be eased of the affliction, they were very willing, but to forsake their sinnes, or to * *take away the accursed thing* (as Covetousnesse, Pride, Infidelitie, &c.) they would not willingly yeeld unto; although sometimes they were compelled to confesse that that was the cause.

* Iosh. 7. 13.

Well, for their better satisfaction, they sought (as it appeares) after some sweet-tongued Chaplaine, and smoothing *Zedechiah*, that would sowe pillowes to their elbowes, and tell them that they need not trouble themselues to search out any cause in themselues, forasmuch as those Iudgements they lay under, were not brought vpon them for their sinnes, but for some other cause best knowne to the Lord.

At length they mett with one Mr. *Norrice* (a Priest of that Countrey) unto whom (as hee confesseth) they made their moane, desiring him to take their condition into his consideration, and to lay downe some grounds to satisfie their troubled Consciences: To this request he willingly hearkened, and answered them according to their owne hearts. Hee told them tho' God deprived them of promised favours, and laid upon them threatned judgements, it was not for their sinnes, but for some other cause: They needed not therefore to trouble themselues to search too much, whether they had any *plague in their owne hearts*, or not; that was to search for a cause where there was none. Nay, hee tells them that they may pray as well as any, and their prayers quallified as the Scriptures require, and yet misse of those things they pray for; delivering for the confirmation of the same, certaine Arguments, which gave good

good content to divers that hoped to be freed from Gods judgements, and yet to retaine their ſinnes ſtill. Hee cured by this meanes divers, but (I dare ſay) it was but as the Prophet ſaith, ſlightly: which kind of cures prooves oftentimes exceeding dangerous: *The latter end of ſuch, proving worſe than their beginning.*

Now 'tis true thoſe arguments he ſent to me, intreating me (as in my other Epiſtle to the Reader I have ſhewed) to ſend him my judgment concerning the point, as alſo, what I conceived concerning his Arguments, which deſire of his (after much perſwaſion) I yeelded unto, and ſent him, aſwell what I conceived of the point, as of his arguments, without either inveighing againſt him, or his Sermon; or writing (as he chargeth me) with my anſwer, any ſharpe invectives againſt him: what I wrote in my booke is to be ſeen, and what I wrote in my letters, is no more but what his letters occaſioned, as I have them by me yet to ſhew.

Hereupon, 'tis true, he ſent about the Country, not (as he falſely affirmeth) my aſſertions only, but divers ſlanders and falſe reports of his own invention not mentioned, or once intended in all my writings. See my anſwer to his Proſopop.

Thus much I manifeſted to divers in thoſe parts, yea, he himſelfe confeſſed, that matters on his part were not well carried, which in ſome meaſure gave me ſatisfaction, whereupon, we were reconciled and lived peaceably, though we differed in judgement.

But after certaine yeares, he revived thoſe ſcandalls and reproaches, affirming what he had ſpoken or written, concerning my writings, were all true, as I have

I have under his hand yet to ſhew. If he medled not with the controverſie, I am ſure hee revived the ſcandalls, and ſo much onely I affirmed in my other Epiſtle: which occaſioned me to publiſh all thoſe paſſages betweene us, that all might judg whither I was guilty of ſuch foule aſperſions, as, by reaſon of his words and collections were laid upon me.

Now for the vindicating (as he ſaith) of himſelfe and the truth, from my ſlanders, hee hath returned ſome anſwer to my booke: wherein (as 'tis evident) he hath neither anſwered the maine points alleaged and defended there, nor yet freed himſelfe from that blame which I have laid to his charge, for his abuſive carriages. And to make this appeare, I thought it neceſſary to returne, by way of defence, a briefe Reply, wherein the maine points laid downe, and confirmed in my other booke, together, with the truth of my anſweres againſt his arguments, are juſtly defended: and not onely ſo, but the weakeneſſe and falſity of the defence of his arguments, contained in his explications, are plainly diſcovered, as it lies in order: whereby (I doubt not) all may ſee, that what I have laid downe before, and here defended, is no more, but what the Scriptures warrant.

In concluſion I deſire the Reader to take notice: Firſt, whereas the adverſarie ſaies in his Epiſtle, hee ſtiles me not *Boy*, according to my name, nor *Beggar* according to the Title of my Booke, ſuppoſing (as his owne words are) I would have taken it for a reproach; I anſwer, I ſhould neither have thought it a proach to be called by my name, nor yet have ſcorned to bee ſtiled the *Beggar* intended in the Title of my Booke. Where-

Wherefore I will not in this my defence ſtile him plaine *Norrice*, according to his name (hee will take that, it ſeemes, as a reproach) but rather, the *Iuſtitiary*, as beſt ſuting with the matter of his booke, and the maine thing all his ſpeeches tend unto. He wholly iuſtifies himſelfe.

Secondly, that whereas he ſaith, he hath not wronged mee a ſillable, in tranſcribing my writings, hee cannot chuſe but ſpeak againſt knowledge, in regard I have ſo plainly made it appeare to him, in my anſwer to his *Proſopopeia*, as that tho hee did ranne, hee might reade it.

Thirdly obſerve, That the truth is not to bee had in admiration, becauſe of mens perſons, nor one jot the better to bee reſpected, or ſooner regarded, becauſe it is curiouſly compoſed, and deckt with humane eloquence: And therefore, though this my defence is not painted with *Vermilion*, and filled with curiouſly-compoſed ſentences, yet let the plain truth (in it ſelfe, very excellent and precious) herein defended, be eſteemed as it is.

As I deſire not that thou ſhouldſt receive any thing, ſo I would not have thee to reject any thing, before thou haſt tryed it.

Some there bee, who are apt to receive a thing for truth before triall: Others againe, doe raſhly condemne, before examination, every thing as untrue, if it ſound contrary to their opinions, or the current of the times. As it is but lightneſſe, and an evident ſigne of a whifling and unſtable minde, to receive, without triall, every doctrine; ſo it cannot but bee inexcuſable careleſneſſe and ſluggiſhneſſe, to reject and condemne every, or, any doctrine before it be tried

ed and examined by the Word of God. *Medium ergo teneamus oh fratres* (as *Gualter's* Counsell is) Let not any rashly, or lightly receive, or peremptorily condemne any doctrine, before it be tryed by the Word: for this is surely a good rule, *to try all things* but *to hold fast that which is good.* And this (courteous Reader) is all that I desire of thee, in respect of what I have written. And thus committing all to thy consideration, and thy selfe to Gods direction. I rest,

Thine in all readinesse to doe thee my best service in any Christian Office.

RICE BOYE.

A PREFACE TO The insuing Reply.

IT was as truely, as fitly spoken of the *Philosopher*, that *magis elucet veritas, quò sæpius ad manum venit*, the oftner the *Trueth* is scanned, the brighter it will appeare to its beholders; It will loose nothing of its weight or glory by being often tryed, but rather like fine gold, shew it selfe the purer: neither will it prosper one jot the worse (tho' after examination) be it both uniustly censured, and cruelly handled, for by how much the more proudly it is oppressed, resisted, or kept under, *eò crescat uberius*, by so much the more plentifully it fructifies. *Paul* may *suffer unto bonds, but the word of God is not bound*. Nay *Pauls* bonds shall bee famous, and the weake brethren, by his sufferings, much more incouraged *to speake the word without* [b] *feare*.

Sen. lib. 2. de Ira. cap. 29.

Rainol. orat. p. 383.

a 2. Tim. 2. 9

b Phil. 1. 13 14.

Wherefore I see no reason why the *Trueth*, or its defenders should be unwilling to bee brought upon

 the

the Stage, or afraid to be resisted by Her, or their opposers, seeing the oftner it is proved and looked vpon, the clearer it appeares, and the more it is opposed and persecuted, the better it growes. The consideration of this makes me confident, that as well the bringing of those maine Truths againe upon the Stage, mentioned and proved in the * *Importunate Begger*, as also a second examination of them, occasioned by that seeming * confutation that is newly come forth against them, will bee a meanes both to gaine those Trueths more credit with divers, who as yet slight them, as also to gather more strength against such as either wilfully, or ignorantly oppose them; and not onely so, but more firmely to stablish all such as out of love haue already imbraced them. Nay I hope by this meanes, the *Importunate Beggers* Importuning God for what Hee hath commanded him to aske, and promised to giue, will be so farre from seeming to any of the better sort to be presumption, a thing disliked by God, as that it will rather prove to be a note of confidence, a thing both approved, desired, and well pleasing to God.

Pag. 3. The matter of the Booke is drawne into three heads.

* Mr. Norrice his Booke.

Well (not to be tedious in the Preface) howsoever men doe judge of it for the present) the taske that I now undertake, is onely to defend, and justifie by Scripture, the lawfullnesse of the *Importunate Beggers Importunity*, or, *the necessitie of the Saints praying to God for necessary temporall blessings without doubting and wavering: And that they may, and ought, as absolutely depend upon the promises of God, for their daily bread, that is, for things necessary, as they may for the pardon of sinne, &c.*

I say

I ſay, the taske that is laid upon me at this preſent, is to defend theſe points and their conſequence, (which I aſſume to performe, through Gods aſſiſtance) with as much brevity and perſpicuity, as the nature of the cauſe ſhall require) againſt Mr. *Norrice* his Titular, or rather ſeeming, or ſuppoſed confutation, in a Treatiſe of his *Intituled a Treatiſe maintaining, that Temporall bleſſings, &c.*

But before I come to an examination and tryall of the confutation it ſelfe, I have ſomthing to ſpeake of the *Title*; And firſt I cannot but obſerue, and admire at his moſt corrupt and injurious dealing, in that hee would once againe (as heretofore hee * indeavoured) faine make men beleeve, that the ground of our Controverſie, or the maine thing I laboured to prove in my Booke, was, *That it is unlawfull to pray to God for Temporall bleſſings, with ſubmiſſion to His will*; for why elſe doth hee make that the Title of his Booke, wherein, as hee giveth out (though without ground) hee hath confuted what I hold concerning Prayer for *neceſſary temporall bleſſings*? Hee thought (as I ſuppoſe) that the very Title would be ſufficient to perſwade men that he had the Truth on his ſide, and what I held contrary to it muſt needs be an errour. And to ſpeake truly; had hepunctually proceeded, and (according to the Title of his Booke) only maintained the lawfulneſſe of praying to God for Temporall Bleſſings, with ſubmiſſion to his will, there had beene no neede of a Controverſie, foraſmuch as wee ſhould well have agreed together in the Truth.

* In his Collections.

For mine owne part, the maine and principall

thing which I aymed at, and preſſed in my Booke
Pag.73. (as in my anſwere to his *Proſopopeia*, I gave him alſo to underſtand) was to perſwad men *to frame all their Prayers with ſubmiſsion to the will of God.* Secondly, hee further adds, (*as it is in the Fourth Petition*) by which words hee labours (as I ſuppoſe) to make men ſtill beleeve, that I hold it not onely unlawfull to Pray with ſubmiſsion to the will of God, but alſo unlawfull to Pray, as it is in the Fourth Petition. Whereas I doe not onely labour to perſwade men to *Pray with ſubmiſsion to the will of God*, but with ſubmiſſion to His will, *as it is in the Fourth Petition.*
*Pag.2.3. 20.21. For doe I not lay the Fourth Petition as the * ſpeciall foundation; and is not all I hold concerning praying for Temporall neceſſary bleſſings built upon it? The premiſes conſidered, it will evidently appeare to all that will ſeriouſly weigh the matter in equall ballance, that the Title of his Booke (though hee pretends it to bee directly contrary to it) and what I hold concerning prayer, doe not diſagree, but may dwell together in unity.

Anſw. Proſopo. p.51. 73. Wherefore I cannot but think (eſpecially ſeeing I ſhewed him before his deceitfulneſſe herein) that meerely of ſet purpoſe, contrary to knowledge, and conſcience, he ſtrives (as much as in him lyeth) to darken the truth, and to blinde the eyes of the ſimple. For he knowes full well (and I deſire all to take notice of it) that the Controverſie or queſtion betweene us was never, whether *the Saints were to pray to God for temporall neceſſaries with ſubmiſsion to his will.* But here ſtill lay the Queſtion, (as in plaine termes I
*Pag.19. * expreſſed) *when are our petitions agreeable,* or (as I explained

explained it elſewhere) *made with ſubmiſsion to the Will of God*? This latter, not the former, was ſtill the ground of the Controverſie. It never came into my heart once to queſtion, whether our petitions were to be made with ſubmiſsion to the Will of God, neither was it ever in the leaſt made by me a part of our Controverſie, that being not (and ſo much I told him) denied (for ought I knew) of any. But when our petitions are agreeable, or made with ſubmiſſion to the Will of God, I ſtudied to give both my ſelfe and others (if I could) ſatisfaction in. And from hence grew the difference betweene us. * Pag. 73. * Pag. 19.

He affirmed that the particle (*If*) made our petitions agreeable to the Will of God: And I held (and ſtill hold) that our petitions are never more agreeable, or made with more ſubmiſſion to the Will of God, than when they are agreeable to his Word, that being the onely direction of all our requeſts. Whence alſo aroſe another difference: He ſtands to maintaine, that it is preſumption for any man abſolutely to beleeve, that the Lord will give his Servants ſuch, or ſuch a temporall bleſſing, though they frame their petitions according, or with ſubmiſſion to his Will revealed in his Word. And I affirme, that the Saints may, and ought abſolutely beleeve, that the Lord will give them their daily bread, that is, things neceſſary for the day they live in: Nay, more, the ſaints may, and ought, as abſolutely aske, and as confidently beleeve, that God who is their gratious Father, wil give them what is contained in the fourth petition, as well as they may aske, and beleeve to receive, what is comprehended in the fifth or ſixth.

And for my owne part, if he, or any elſe (yet hee hath not done it) can ſhew any good reaſon from Scripture to the contrary, I ſhall quickly yeeld up the controverſie. I am willing to wait his leaſure.

Proſo.p.50. Next I obſerve in the Title page, how he uſeth the Word *Temporalls* (as in his collections he uſeth the word bleſſings) *Indefinitely*, notwithſtanding I uſe them definitly, of ſuch bleſſings as God hath commanded us to aske, and promiſed to give.

What I have further ſaid concerning this, is to be ſeene in my Anſ. to his proſop.p.50,51 This (as I told him before) is but a piece of his *Sophiſtry*, wherein he thinks to poſſeſſe his Reader, that I hold it lawfull to pray abſolutely for all temporall bleſſings whatſoever: and then can any one conclude any leſſe, but that it is a way that is meerly preſumptious? This I had to ſay concerning the Title.

Now before I come to the booke it ſelfe, I muſt ſay ſomething in anſwer to ſome few things mentioned in the Epiſtle, and they are theſe in number.

Firſt, he taxeth mee with *Deceit, or guile, in that I came unto him before what I held concerning praying for outward neceſſary bleſsings was publikely knowne, and craftily demands of him, whether we may not abſolutely pray unto God for bread, and depend upon his providence for neceſſaries, &c.*

Anſw. The ſumme or ſubſtance of all the Treatiſe is (as we ſhall ſhew hereafter) but a ſeeming confutation, and therefore it is not much to be wondred at, that it is begun with ſlanders. For I neither came unto him before what I held concerning the matter in Controverſie was publikely knowne, nor yet craftily demanded the Queſtion before mentioned.

That

That it was publikely knowne before I came unto him it is evident, in that I was violently prosecuted, and articled against in the open Court by potent adversaries for the very points that are now in Controversie. And I think this was publike enough. Well, after this open prosecution (not being wel able as I conceived, to resist the fury of my adversaries) I repaired to him, as to a speciall friend, and told him the whole matter: which done, I demanded of him (tis true) *whether we may not absolutely pray to God for bread, &c.* This I did (not craftily) but out of an earnest desire to receive some grounds of confirmation in the thing, that I might bee the better able to manifest and defend it against mine opposers; or else some grounds of confutation, that I might avoid their fury by acknowledgement. Whereupon (as he here confesseth) he made me this answere, * That we might and ought pray as I said.

At Sarum in Wilts.

* Compare this speech of his with his first argument, & you shall find a plain contradiction.

Now let all that are judicious, and indifferent, judge: First, whether hee hath not begun with a slander? And secondly, whether hee hath not yeelded the point, or at least spoken so plainely in defence of it, as if hee had studied to confute himselfe at his first entrance: what? may and ought the saints (by his owne confession) absolutely pray to God for bread, and depend upon his providence for necessaries? How then can he justly except against what I have written, seeing the speciall thing I presse the Saints unto, is to pray *absolutely unto God for necessary temporall things*, and *that they may and ought, absolutely depend upon the promises of God for their dayly bread, &c.* as it is expressed in the

the Title, it being the ſumme and ſubſtance of all the matter contained in my booke. Wherefore from his owne confeſſion I may cleerely conclude (let the wiſe judge of it) that the maine Doctrines laid down and defended by me in my booke is no more but the very Truth.

Next, he tells the Reader, that *ſhortly after, hee underſtood, that under bread, and neceſſaries, wee intended health, life, foode, raiment, &c. and if any did not obtaine them, it was becauſe they wanted faith*, and withall, affirmes in the margine of his booke, that I *publikely maintained the faith of miracles to continue ſtill, and that all which died of the Plague wanted faith.*

Anſwere. What I intended by *bread*, I haue plainly expreſſed in my Book, and if I have miſunderſtood the meaning of our Saviour, or if I underſtand the word *bread* to comprehend more then Chriſt intends in it, hee might have done well, either in this place, or ſome where elſe, in his Booke to have ſet downe my miſtake, together with the particulars which I ſaid, are comprehended in the word *bread*, but not intended by our Saviour. This would indeed have beene to ſome purpoſe. But to ſay under *Bread* and *neceſſaries*, I intend ſuch and ſuch things, and never ſhew where, or upon what ground I ſo conceive it; neither by Scripture ſhew the falſity of it, is labour to little purpoſe. But more of this when I come to examine his owne expoſition, or what is meant by the word *Bread*: onely here by the way I would faine know of him: firſt, whether it be lawfull to pray for health, foode, rayment, good ſucceſſe in lawfull affaires, and ſuch like things concerning the outward

outward man? Secondly, to which of the Petitions (if hee grant it lawfull to pray for them) are those requests to be referred, or in which are they comprehended, if not within the compasse of the Fourth Petition? or whether they are without the compasse of them all?

He confesseth the summe of all lawfull Petitions is contained in the Lords Prayer. pag. 2.

These doubts being resolved, the matter (I doubt not) will appeare the plainer, either of his or our side.

Secondly how, or upon what grounds I affirme, the want of *Bread*, that is, *things necessary*, or the not obtaining of such things which God hath commanded us to aske, and promised to give, is to be attributed to the *want of Faith*; I have plainly and largely shewed in my Booke, unto which I referre the Reader, desiring him to view it well, and withall to take notice, that in all this pretended confutation, hee hath neither directly answered my allegations, or once shewed how the Scriptures alledged by mee in defence of what I hold, serve not to prove that for which I alledged them, and yet hee is so impudent as to affirme, hee hath confuted all.

Lastly, Whereas he affirmes, I publikely maintained the *faith of Miracles to continue still*, and *that all that died of the Plague wanted faith*: I am perswaded hee speakes more then hee knowes, for (I dare be bold to say) no such matter was ever publikely maintained by me in his hearing: All the ground he hath for it is, heare-say. Oh how well doe his practise in matters of this nature, suite with those mentioned in the Prophet, report *Iere. 20. 10.

ſay they, and wee will report it. And to ſpeake truely, I know not his equall in all that Countrey for tale receiving, and reporting of it. If once he get a tale by the end, it ſhall want no motion, if his words or letters will give it life. I referre it to tryall; as for the things themſelues, heere mentioned by him, I will not for preſent ſpeake much concerning them, it being but a Marginall noate, and mentioned by him, but by the way, onely I thinke it not amiſſe to propoſe unto him a queſtion or two concerning it.

Firſt whether a man may not in theſe times be really poſſeſt of the Devill? If yea, then ſecondly, Whether it be not lawfull to ſeeke to God by prayer in ſuch a caſe? Thirdly, whether it be not poſſible for a Saint, or Saints, by effectuall fervent prayer unto God, or by Faith in Chriſts name, to caſt him out? If not, then whether it bee not a meere mockery to ſeeke for that which is impoſſible to be had? If it be obtaineable, nay obtained, whether then to caſt out a Devill by Faith in Chriſts name, be not a Miracle?

Now whether all that die of the Plague, want faith in the apprehenſion of that particular promiſe, let the 91 *Pſalme* determine: And whether thoſe promiſes doe belong to the Saints in theſe times, and whether God bee not as well able to helpe, and as faithfull now as ever, I leave it to all to judge. And this is all that I will ſay for preſent concerning theſe things.

In the next place, I much marvell with what conſcience this man can now turne informer againſt

gainſt me to the Biſhops or their Chaplaines? For heere he tells them that I am runne out into another extremity of Seperation, diſclaiming utterly of the Church, or any communion with it. I ſay, I aske with what Conſcience this man can undertake ſuch an office? eſpecially ſeeing in the firſt place (put caſe I doe ſeperate, and diſclaime the Church of *England*, and all communion with it) I practiſe no more, but what hee, and other *Nonconformiſts* teach. And to ſpeake truly, I cannot but admire with * Docter *Burges*, that all of their minds, who are conſcionable, doe not ſeperate, &c. What? is it an errour, and a falling into extremity (at leaſt in his judgement) to follow what his owne grounds leads unto? Preface to the Reioined. p. 5.

Secondly, the informing the Biſhops, or their adherents with ſuch a thing as this, is no way pertinent to the things controverted concerning Prayer: And therefore I know not why hee ſhould doe it, unleſſe by this meanes he thought to curry favor with them, and to make an attonement betweene himſelfe and them, by a Sacrifice (at leaſt) of my liberty: or it may be he thought by this meanes to have my tongue and hand ſo tyed, as that I ſhould not have ſo much liberty, as to diſcover his dealing, and to defend the truth againſt him; let him make the beſt Apologie for himſelfe hee can, hee will never bee able to free himſelfe from the juſt imputation of a cruell perſecutor: And certainly hee that will either by information, or treachery deliver a man into the hands of ſuch as will (at leaſt in his eſteeme)

worke his ruine, would confound him himſelfe, if hee had power in his hand to doe it. Well, whatſoever hee intended, or whatſoever trouble to come to mee by it, I am ſure I ſhall have more comfort in ſuffering of it, then hee can have in procuring or bringing it upon mee.

And this alſo I had to ſay in this place, to thoſe things mentioned in the Epiſtle; Now I proceede to the Booke it ſelfe.

A IVST

A IVST DEFENCE OF The lawfulneſſe of the *Fmportunate* BEGGER'S *FMPORTVNITY.*

WHatſoever hath beene ſaid, as well concerning the abſolute perfection of that form of prayer, commonly called, The *Lords Prayer*, as alſo of the meaning of the fourth Petition, is fully granted by mine oppoſite at the very firſt entrance; for firſt he * confeſſeth, that Chriſt Ieſus hath not only left his ſervants direction by his ſpeeches occaſionally uttered, how to pray, with what petitions, and to what ends, but by a forme of prayer purpoſely made, containing the ſumme of all lawfull petitions, and the order of them. Secondly, that by bread mentioned in the fourth Petition, is meant all the *abſolute neceſſaries of this life, as Bread, &c. And that which is deſired in this Petition, is * Maintenance for life, &c. pag. 2. pag. 3. pag. 4.

It is granted therefore (I ſay) at the firſt entrance. Firſt, that the Lords prayer (according to what I have written) is *exemplar abſoluti ſſimum*, ſuch an abſolute pattern of prayer, as that there is nothing in it ſuperfluous, neither is there *Imp. Beg. p. 2.

any thing essentiall to prayer wanting. Secondly, that in the fourth petition, we are taught by our Saviour, to pray for *Bread*, that is, (as I have expounded in my * book) for things necessary for our present beeing, or for the day we live in.

* pag. 21. See also pa. 17.

Thus much he expressly confesseth in his Epistle.

And thirdly, that the Saints of God may, and ought (as 'tis laid downe by me, *page* 3.) absolutely pray and depend upon God for the same. Whence then it must follow, and that by his owne confession: First, that there is no need of an *If*, in the fourth petition, or wee are to pray absolutely for the things contained in that petition, as well as we are, for the things contained in the rest. And secondly that the cause is in our selves if we doe not obtaine them: for if wee must pray absolutely for them, the promises must needs be absolute, and then of necessity it must follow (as I have * shewed) that the cause is in our selves if we doe not obtaine them.

pag. 10, &c.

And thus much (besides what he hath said in the exposition of the words) heefully grants in his first doctrine, which he collects from the coherence, and thus it followes:

pag. 6. *Such as have first truly sought spirituall blessings, may comfortably aske the supply of their outward wants.* And this he proves by divers instances, as *Ezra*, *Nehemiah*, *David*, and others. All these prayed in faith: and the reason hee gives for it is, *because so run the promises, Seeke first, the Kingdome of God, &c. Matth.* 6. 33. *Psalm.* 33. 18, 19. *Such* (saith hee) *may expect it.* Whereupon in his second use he proclaimes comfort to all such as in the truth of their hearts, seeke, desire, and pray, for the remission of sinnes, &c? in the first place. These have the evidence of adoption, they may come to God, as their Father, and expect at his hands any spiritual or temporall good, bread, life, food, apparell, good successe in their lawfull endeavours, &c. as things promised to such persons: and if they have them not, it is because the Lord will chasten them for some evill, &c. So are his own words.

pag. 12. 13.

To what purpose now doe all his argumeuts serve? but directly either to contradict himselfe, or shew that hee understands

derſtands not well whereof, or what hee affirmes? This (me thinks) is ſtrange kinde of preaching, firſt, to expound a Scripture, and then to draw from it ſome poſition according to the meaning of it, and afterwads to frame five arguments before he move from the place directly to contradict it? Is not this to deſtroy againe the things a man built? *ſed adrem*, let us a little further examine his third Doctrine, which concernes the quantitie or meaſure of outward things that are to bee asked at the hands of God in prayer, and that is, *dayly bread*, neceſſaries for this preſent time: And thus it is: *That ſuperfluities are not to be asked in prayer, but that which is neceſſary for the preſent uſe.* This alſo he confirmes by divers inſtances. The reaſon alſo allegaged by him is, *becauſe ſuperfluities are not promiſed (though ſometimes diſpenced) but that which is expedient to ſupport us in livelyhood and fitneſſe for our ſeverall imployments*, For which hee citeth *Pſalm.* 34.10. *Hebrew.* 13.5. So is his third Doctrine.

Doct. 3. pag. 23.

pag. 24.

Wherein hee againe confeſſeth, firſt, that whomſoever ſhall aske abundance, or ſuperfluity goes beyond his bounds.

Secondly, That neceſſaries for the preſent uſe, are to be prayed for.

Thirdly, That God hath promiſed us ſo much of outward things, as is expedient to ſupport us in livelyhood, and fitneſſe for our ſeverall imployments. Now what are theſe concluſions, but the principall * poſitions (as before 'tis noted) laid downe and defended by me? The other points in my booke are but as ſo many branches ſpringing from theſe rootes; And (I dare ſay) thoſe principles being granted, the reſt (in any indifferent judicious judgement) muſt of neceſsity follow.

See pag. 21. of my booke.

What need now any further defence of the lawfulneſſe of abſolute praying to God for temporall neceſſaries, ſeeing 'tis acknowledged and juſtified by him, who thought directly to oppoſe it? And therefore this Truth of *abſolute*

praying

praying to God for neceſſaries, may boldly *put off her Armour*, as having of this her Adverſarie, fully gotten the victory.

But ſtay ſay ſome, you are too quicke in the buſineſse, you have viewed as yet ſcarce the one halfe of the *Treatiſe*, and therefore, though in this firſt part of his Booke, hee grants as much as you deſire, and pleade for what you have taught concerning Prayer for outward Bleſsings, yet if you reade the other part, you ſhall find: Firſt that hee reproves it as an errour. Secondly, That he frames 5 *Arguments*, as well *to rectifie the judgments of thoſe that erre*; as to comfort ſuch as are *unworthily dejected*.

It ſeemes by that, he intended not to juſtifie the point, though, unawares he was compelled to doe it. It was not amiſſe therfore a little to weigh the nature of the reproſe, as alſo the explications of his arguments againſt the former anſweres, that the honeſt-hearted Reader, who deſires ſatisfaction, may be able the better to judge and determine whether the Truth, laid downe and defended by you, and acknowledged by him in the firſt part of his booke, is ſubſtantiall confuted in the latter part of the ſame.

Anſw: For the better ſatiſfaction of the honeſt hearted Reader I am willing to undertake the thing, even ſeriouſly to weigh, and examine his reproofe, with the explications of his *arguments*, and I doubt not (through God aſsiſtance) but I ſhall be able ſo cleerely to vindicate the Trueth of what I held (and ſtill hold) concerning Prayer for outward neceſsaries (whatſoever is ſaid to the contrary) as that hee that *runnes, ſhall reade it*.

But firſt (me thinke) I cannot but obſerue the wonderfull power of God, together with the ſpeciall care hee takes, to uphold his Truth againſt its oppoſers: foraſmuch as by an over-ruling hand, he compells men often times to ſpeake, and write many things in defence of it, when they intend nothing leſſe, but rather wholy to contradict it.

A preg-

A pregnant example and proofe of Gods dealing with men herein, is heere presented to our viewe: For behold here is the Fourth Petition expounded, some observations raised from it, and by Scripture confirmed, and by and by Five *arguments* framed directly to contradict them; which shewes, first Gods overruling power in extracting from the *Preacher* an acknowledgement of the Truth: And Secondly, that his intention was not to speake for it, but wholy against it.

And therefore (in this respect) hee may well call his Booke a confutation, for sure I am, the latter part directly contradicts the former.

Neither is the Lords dealing with men after this manner any new thing, for *Baalam* must *blesse*, when hee intends to *curse*, and speake admirable Truthes, when hee intends nothing lesse, yea *Saul* sometimes is *among the Prophets*, and compelled to prophesie; and *Caiaphas* must *councell the People* concerning the *Truth*, though of himselfe hee intended no such matter. But to the thing in hand. Numb. 24. 1 Sam. 10. Iohn 11. 50. 18. 14.

And first let us begin with his use of reproofe, being (as I take it) as it were a Preface, to make way for his ensuing arguments; and thus it followes,

2. *THe errour and deceit of them, that under the name of* Daily bread, *and things necessary, will comprehend all such particulars, as they conceive to be good for them, or theirs, such as are Health, Liberty, Peace, Food, Rayment, good successe in such or such a businesse, designe, or purpose.* Pag. 27.

Reply. WHosoever under the name of *daily bread*, and things necessary, comprehend all such particulars, as they simply conceive to bee good for them or theirs, Wee confesse indede, therein they erre, and comes justly within the compasse of reproofe, and elsewhere is condemned by us. Wee are not to be our owne Imp. Beg. p. 21

chooſers concerning matters of this life; that is no better then to goe about to confine Gods will to our wills, and to what wee deſire, but rather wee are to confine and limit our wills to Gods will, and not ſuffer our deſires to ſwell above its limits. Our Vnderſtandings and conceivings are ſo weake and ſhallow, as wee know not what is good for our ſelves, or ours, and therefore it will prove but meere folly to truſt to our owne conceivings. Now if the *Iuſticiary* intends this reproofe (thus underſtood) againſt us, his reproofe will prove but a ſlander.

But hee ſets down the particulars which thoſe as hee reproves, conceives to be good for them, as *Health*, *Foode*, *Rayment*, *&c.*

To which I anſwere; Firſt it is very ſtrange, that hee ſhould brand a ſort of people with an errour, and not perceive that hee himſelfe is moſt deepely guilty of it, unleſſe hee quite forgot what a little before hee * taught the people. There hee labours to comfort ſuch as in the Truth of their hearts, *pray for the remiſsion of ſinnes, the favour of God, &c. in the firſt place*, aſsuring them withall *that they may come to God as their loving Father, and expect at his hands any Spirituall or Temporall good, Bread, Food, Apparell, &c, as things promiſed to ſuch perſons.*

* Pag. 13.

Doth hee not himſelfe comprehend all theſe under the name of *Bread* and *neceſsaries*? And doth hee not affirme they are promiſed to Gods people? And yet hee reproves it, as errour and deceite.

A plaine contradiction.

Secondly, what wee conceive is comprehended under the name of daily bread, and things neceſſary, is largely and plainly to be ſeene in my other Booke, unto which I referre the Reader.

And that wee are not to aske (as tis falſly laid to our charge) what wee conceive is good for us, but what the Lord in his written Word ſayes is good for us, wee have alſo plainly ſhewed. And therefore (as before, ſo againe) wee acknowledge, *that wee are to aske only what God commandeth*

mandeth us, and beleeve to receive only that which hee hath promiſed in his Scriptures.

Tis true indeede, wee affirmed (and ſtill doe) that what God hath commanded his ſervants to aske, and promiſed to give, they need not queſtion whether it be good for them: For will hee command them to aske, and promiſe to give them things which are hurtfull? Or did any of the Saints in former times ever make any Queſtion of it? This me thinke (yea in the *Juſticiary's* owne judgement) would be but a groſſe conceite.

Wherefore if God hath commanded us to aske, Health, Food, rayment, good ſucceſſe in our lawfull imployments, &c. wee may lawfully by prayer ſeeke unto him for them, or either of them; and if hee hath promiſed upon our ſeeking to give us theſe, or any of theſe, wee may warrantably depend upon him for them, elſe not.

And thus much alſo is expreſly mentioned in our former Treatiſe.

But hee proceeds.

WIthall charging their Conſciences, with as certaine beliefe of obtaining theſe perticulars, as of remiſſion of ſinnes, the grace of God, and ſalvation it ſelfe, and thereupon condemning and judging ſuch for unbeleevers in that behalfe, as obtaine not by prayer all, or any of theſe perticulars ſo conceived to be good, expedient or neceſſary for them. Pag. 19, 20, 21.

Reply. FIrſt, wee know not for our parts any that either condemne or judge ſuch for unbeleevers in that behalfe, as obtaine not by prayer, ſuch perticulars as they only conceive to be good, expedient, or neceſſary for them; but rather wee judge and condemne ſuch for evill doers in that behalfe, as once preſume to aske any thing at the hands of God, and have no better warrant but their owne conceits that it is good for them.

And therefore let the Reader take notiſe by the way, that the *Iuſticiary* doth little better then caſt a falſe aſperſion upon men, that he might bring them within the compaſſe of his reproofe.

Secondly, It is true, wee charge the Conſcienees of the Saints with ascertaine beliefe of obtaining thoſe outward neceſſary bleſsings in the perticulars which God hath commanded to aske, and promiſed to give, as of remiſsion of ſinnes, the grace of God, and ſalvation it ſelfe, and thereupon wee juſtly taxe both our ſelves and others, for unbeliefe in that behalfe, or for fayling in ſome of Faiths companions, if wee obtaine not by Prayer, ſuch perticular bleſsings ſo commanded by God to be asked, and promiſed by him to be given us: For if all the Promiſes (as well Temporaries as Spirituall) as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh) are *in Chriſt yea and Amen*: And if God is faithfull in every one of them, and for the keeping the leaſt, hee hath laid his credit to pawne, it muſt of neceſsity follow, that wee may juſtly taxe our ſelues for unbeliefe, or for fayling in ſome of Faiths companion, if by prayer wee doe not obtaine them. And I doubt not, but upon ſerious conſideration, and impartiall examination, this will appeare to ſuch as are Indifferent, to be a Truth, and no deceite or errour. But he hath ſomthing elſe to ſay againſt it, and to prove it erronious, hee againe layes downe ſome Arguments, together with ſome explication of them, which comes next in order in his Booke to bee conſidered of; and thus they follow.

2. Cor. 1. 10.

Concerning this, ſee at large in our other Treatiſe. pap. 6. 7, &c.

ARGV-

ARGVMENT I.

THoſe promiſes that have implyed conditions in them cannot abſolutely bee relyed upon, or expected, for our faith is grounded upon the promiſes:

But the promiſes of outward things (although neceſſary) are ſuch.

Therefore they are not abſolutely to be relied upon or expected.

Reply. THis argument is already anſwered, by denying the minor, as alſo the inſufficiency of thoſe places or caſes alleaged by him for the confirmation of it, is clearly manifeſted, and therfore I need ſay no more concerning it: onely in briefe, I cannot but take notice (and I wiſh the Reader to obſerve it) how all that is ſaid in anſwere to this his firſt Argument, is in expreſſe termes granted by him to be true. The ſumme of the anſwer lies in the denying of his Minor, the equity of which negation (as appeareth expreſly in his * Epiſtle) is fully acknowledged: For (ſaith he) we may, and ought *abſolutely pray unto God for bread, and depend upon his providence for neceſſaries.* Is not here an acknowledgment in expreſſe termes, that his *Minor* propoſition is falſe, according as is affirmed in our anſwer to it? For, if wee may, and ought abſolutely pray to God, and depend upon his providence for bread and neceſſaries (as hee confeſſeth) then the promiſes for bread and neceſſaries, have no conditions implyed in them; but wee may and ought (by his owne confeſsion) abſolutely pray unto God, and depend upon his providence for neceſſaries. Therefore, the promiſes (by his owne confeſsion) for bread, and neceſſaries, haue no conditions implyed in them. And conſequently, thoſe caſes alledged by him, for the confirmation

See my anſwer to his Arguments. pag. 31

pag. 3.

firmation of his minor falls to the ground. If this bee not a contradiction of his (as we say) *in directa serie*, then (according to the Proverbe) let him that taught mee logicke give mee my mony againe. But let us heare what hee sayes further,

Explication. *When I say that the promises of temporall things have conditions implyed in them, I deny not that there are any conditions expressed concerning those things, for it is plaine that there are,* Levit. 26. *&c. But that such promises, as runne generally, and seeme to bee absolute, have yet certaine condition implyed, and reservations to the will and pleasure of God, &c.*

Reply First, then it is agreed upon betweene all parties, that those promises in *Deut.* 28. and *Levit.* 26. and such like, were made upon condition of the peoples obedience. *If thou obey*, that is, thou obeying *his Commandements, these, and these blessings shall be bestowed on thee.*

Secondly, it is also confessed on our behalfe, that such promises as runne generally without limitation, and reservation, are made upon the same * condition of the peoples obedience, though that condition is not expressed. And doth not the *Iustitiary* himselfe, at first understand the *implyed condition* in such promises, to be of the same nature with that which is expressed? that is, doth he not confesse, that the one, as well as the other, is made upon condition of the peoples obedience? But by and by (Sophister like: to deceive the simple) he makes the *condition implied* in those promises as run generally to be of another nature, quite different from the nature of that, which in the other promises is expressed.

* Thus much is manifested in my other Treatise, as appeares by the scope of it.

The *condition expressed* is the peoples obedience. If thou obey, &c. and this wee yeeld unto: *The condition implyed* (as now he makes it) *is a reservation to the secret will of God* no where expressed in the Word of God, and this wee oppo-

so

poſe, as not intended in any of the promiſes. *Secret things belong to the Lord alone, but things revealed, to us and our children for ever.*

But he proceeds.

WHereas then the temporary inſulteth in his great victory gotten out of the Word (implyed) as arguing, that in no place conditions are expreſſed: it is very vaine, the propoſition being directed to Gods adminiſtration in particular to his ſeverall Servants, according to his will, which in that reſpect is ſecret to himſelfe, &c. * pag. 36.

Reply. FIrſt, all that the *Iuſtitiary* have yet expreſſed, hath not made the victory which the truth hath gotten out of the word (*implyed*) one jot leſſe. Neither is our arguing thence, that in no place ſuch conditions are expreſſed, ſo vaine as he ſpeakes of. That the promiſes of outward bleſsings are made upon condition of our obedience, and that that condition is expreſſed we readily againe acknowledge: but that any condition, or ſecret reſervation, to the ſecret will of God therein, is expreſſed we utterly deny. Nay are not his owne words, an expreſſe contradiction? for how can this implyed condition bee ſecret to God alone, and yet expreſſed in his word?

Wherefore wee may ſtill conclude, that to affirme the promiſes of God for temporall things is conditionall (as he underſtands it) is (according to his owne words) *a doctrine of mans invention, and not of God.*

Secondly, whereas hee ſpeakes ſo much of Gods *ſecret will*, and that the promiſes of outward things have conditions implyed in them in reſpect of Gods *ſecret will or purpoſe*: I anſwer, that all he ſayes herein is quite beſides the matter: for the matter, or ſubject handled by us, is not any thing at all concerning Gods ſecret will or purpoſe concerning his ſervants: but what hee hath revealed concerning them in his word.

The

The promiſes we ſpeake of are all revealed, and the conditions of thoſe promiſes are all revealed, and the manner how God will deale with his ſervants is alſo revealed. As for his ſecret intentions, his decrees his purpoſes, or ſecret reſervations we are not once to meddle with, foraſmuch as *revealed things onely belong to us and our children for ever.*

It is therefore a fiction of the *Iuſticiaries* owne braine a *Non ens*, a new nothing to ſpeake of Conditions implyed in the promiſes in reſpect of Gods ſecret will or purpoſe. And therefore I cloſe up this with an anſwere which Maſter *Culverwell* made in the ſame caſe: *Any indifferent Readers may ſee his groſſe miſtake herein; For what I ſpeake of Gods bountie in providing meanes (or making promiſes) whereby his Children might live more comfortably, if the fault were not in themſelves, he underſtands of Gods Decree, which is unchangeable, and cannot bee fruſtrate. So that all his diſcourſe hereof, as many others, might well haue beene ſpared.*

* Anſwer to certaine obiections againſt his Treatiſe of faith. pag. 4.

pag. 38. 39. NExt he proceeds, and wiſheth the Reader to obſerve *our fooliſh reaſoning, in that to diſprove Conditions implyed, we grant conditions expreſſed, yet intending the contrary* for proofe whereof, he alleages theſe words of ours, *you know and muſt needs confeſſe, &c. which words* (as he ſuppoſeth) *need no other confutation than themſelves*, &c.

Reply. VVHen fooles throw ſtooles (according to the Proverbe) wiſe men muſt take heed of their ſhins: Howſoever, in granting conditions expreſſed, wee intend not the contrary, but juſtly diſprove ſuch conditions as he ſayes are implyed. The condition granted to bee expreſſed (and all the * conditions too) is obedience. Now in granting ſuch conditions to be expreſſed, we intended indeed to diſprove any conditions of any other nature, or kinde to be either expreſſed or implyed. And herein I wiſh the Reader to obſerve the deceitfull dealing of the

* So are my words, pag. 37.

Iuſticiary

Iuſticiary, who in all his diſcourſe, when hee ſpeakes of a Condition *imployed* in the promiſes, never intends the *Condition Obedience*, but ſome reſervation of the ſecret will of God; wherein (I dare ſay) hee ſhewes more deceit, then wee fooliſhneſſe in our reaſoning.

Secondly that thoſe words of mine alledged by him confute not themſelues, the words themſelues will eaſily ſhew.

For whereas I ſay, *that the Lord made abſolutely to his people* Iſrael, *precious promiſes*, Levit.26.&c. *In which promiſes there is no Condition implyed, &c*, my meaning is (as the very words import) that in thoſe and the like promiſees, there is no *Condition*, or ſecret reſervation to Gods ſecret will implyed, but yet a Condition expreſſed, and that is Obedience: which Condition lyes on mans part, if thou obey: Gods part is abſolute, all theſe bleſsings ſhall come upon thee.

Wee are not once to imagine, but that it is Gods will to beſtow them on us.

Neither will it hence follow, that the Lord made a Covenant with himſelfe (as the *Iuſticiary* dreameth) and not with men.

The Covenant is made by God, not with himſelfe, but with man, yet the Condition lyeth on mans part to performe, though God made it. The meaning then of my words is plaine, and it may be taken thus: The Lord promiſed his people, provided they would obey his voice, ſuch and ſuch bleſsings, now the people obeying his voice, it muſt be (according to the promiſe) that ſuch and ſuch bleſsings ſhould come upon them.

The Lords owne Condition being by his people performed, he muſt needs give them the things promiſed upon that Condition.

It is no longer (with reſpect be it ſpoken) in Gods power (they obſerving what he requires) to give, or not to give them, what hee hath thus promiſed: for though it was an acte of Mercy, to make any ſuch promiſe to his people, yet it is an acte of Iuſtice to performe them

1.Epiſt.1.9. being made. *If yee confeſe your ſinnes* (ſaith Iohn) *hee is faithfull, and juſt to forgive your ſinnes*: And *if yee be willing, and obedient*, is hee not as faithfull and juſt to give us Iſay.1.19. *the good of the Land*? Nay he can as well deny himſelfe (as Imp.Beg.p.21 wee have ſhewed) wee obſerving what hee requires) as deny the things hee hath promiſed to give us, whether it bee concerning Soule or body.

Pag.6.7. Hence it was that wee affirmed, and by Scripture ſubſtantially proved, that the Promiſes of Temporall neceſſaries, and the promiſes of Eternall favours are equally abſolute, and is not Faith required in the one as well as in the other?

Hee that is willing and obedient, ſhall eate the good of the Iſay. 1. *Land*; *Hee that beleeveth, and is Baptized, ſhall be ſaved.* Marke 16. Are not theſe Promiſes equally abſolute? And is not Faith and Obedience required for the obtaining of the one as well as the other? Nay, may it not be as truely affirmed, that whoſoever wanteth bread, comes ſhort of the apprehenſion of the *Temporall promiſes*, as well as it is maintained, that whoſoever commeth ſhort of heaven, it is becauſe hee wanteth faith in apprehending the *eternall promiſes*? Not that the promiſes have any other originall ground, or foundation, but Gods meere love. All the promiſes are in CHRIST meerely of grace, hee foreſaw nothing in man that mov'd him to make them: In a word, there was no cauſe, or motive without himſelfe, that provoked him to it: yet Faith is ordained and required of God, as a meanes to obtaine the end of thoſe promiſes, and therefore without Faith and Obedience, they are not to be expected.

So hee affirmeth in his Exceptions againſt Mr. Thia. p.160. And in this reſpect, are not all the promiſes, both Temporall and Spiritual ſaid to be *Conditionall*? Or is not faith the Condition (at leaſt in the *Iuſticiaries* judgement) of the Goſpel's Promiſes? Wherefore may wee not truely affirme, That hee that beleeveth ſhall abſolutely be ſaved, and hee that is willing and obedient, ſhall abſolutly eate the good of the Land? My long diſcourſe then of the ſinnes and puniſhments of the *Iſraelits* (contrary to his conceit) is

is pertinent to the thing in hand, and makes for the confirmation of my assertions, which I note the rather, because of his groundlesse imagination, that it makes against mee: for in that they lost Temporalls, through their disobedience, it shewes, First *the cause was in themselues they did not obtaine them.*

And Secondly, had they obeyed God, they had injoyed them.

And therefore had I in that place affirmed, his Preaching was little better then Popery, it had beene neither insolent nor reproachfull taunting.

Explication. TO the answere to his first Instance, hee sayes, *that in our scandalous practise in the Countrey, the whole burthen was put upon* Faith, *and beleeving generally: but I step in to refine the matter, and joyne many other things, as included, &c. All which was framed* (as he conceives) *to hide the shame of our opinion, &c.*

Reply. VVHat man? to hid the shame of our opinion? And was our practise in the Countrey so scandalous? As for our carriages, they are knowne in the Countrey, and let the Countrey speake. Neither have wee in the least refined the matter, by joyning other things as included, but as at the first it was held, so now tis published by us.

And therefore such as made any contrary complaint to him, shewed themselues to be but *tale-bearers*, as hee manifests himselfe to be a *tale-receiver*: And between them I finde but a very little difference; the one hath the Devill in his tongue, and the other in his eare. And let both take heed lest hee possesse the heart.

Explication. TO the answere to his Second Instant concerning Persecution, hee sayes, *That Persecution in it selfe, and its owne nature considered, is no Blessing, but a mischiefe rather, and misery, an evill to be prayed against, &c.* Pag 43.

Reply. FIrſt, what hee intends by Perſecution in it ſelfe, or its owne nature conſidered, I will not ſtand to examine. For mine owne part, I ſpeake of Perſecution, *qua tale*, as it is a ſuffering for righteouſneſſe ſake.

And this I ſay is no miſchiefe, nor miſery, but a bleſſing rather, not to be prayed againſt; for proofe of this, I refeare the Reader to what I have written in my other Treatiſe in defence of it.

Pag. 23. 36. 66. 67.

2. If it be ſuch a miſchiefe and miſery, and evill to be prayed againſt, me thinks it is ſtrange that the Saints ſhould account it a *rich treaſure, that they ſhould *rejoyce that they were accounted worthy of it*, that they ſhould *glory in it*, and that the *Apoſtle* ſhould exhort *Timothy to partake of it*.

*Heb. 11. 26 Acts 5. 41. Gal. 6. 14.

Thirdly, If it be ſuch a miſchiefe, and miſery to be Perſecuted, or reproached for the Truth, I wonder why the *Inſtitutary* tells us, pag. 153. That he accounts himſelfe unworthy to ſuffer rebuke for the Truth: unleſſe hee thinke himſelfe (as the drift of his Booke is) ſo compleat, as that he deſerues it not becauſe it is a miſchiefe, or miſery.

*2. Tim. 1. 8.

But next, Wheras he ſayes that *the Contrary is to bee deſided, i.* (as I take his meaning) freedome from Perſecution, that wee ſhall not ſuffer is to be prayed for, for which he citeth divers places; I am ſure that thoſe Scriptures ſerue not to prove any ſuch thing: Wee will a little examine them as they lie.

The firſt is *Pſalm.* 74. wholly. In which Pſalme the Church, or people of God, doe, as it were debate the matter with God concerning their condition: wherein we are to examine the cauſe, or ground of the Lords dealing with them, in giving them over to the hands of their enemies. The cauſe then, why the Enemie did ſo oppreſſe them, was not becauſe they kept cloſe to God, and walked obediently towards him: In a word, it was not for *righteouſneſſe ſake*, but it was becauſe they *diſobeyed the voice of the *Lord, and lightly eſteemed the rocke of their Salvation. They provoked him to jelouſie with their ſtrange Gods*, &c.

*Deu. 32. 15. &c

There-

Therefore, (as the * Scriptures prove) the Lord gave them up into the hands of their enemies, even to be oppreſſed by their adverſaries. And this was no more, but what was foretold them. They ſhould be the *tayle, & not the head* (if they forſooke his Lawes) *and other Lords ſhould rule over them.* Wherfore there is a great diſparity between thoſe ſufferings of the Church of God then, & the perſecution the Church of of God now. It could not be in thoſe times that the Church ſhould be given over to the oppreſſion of their adverſaries, unleſſe they forſooke the * *Rock of their ſalvation, and provoked him to anger with their abominations*: but now, the cloſer the Saints walke with God, the more they are perſecuted by the adverſaries. Therefore (ſaith the Apoſtle) *wee both labour and ſuffer reproach, becauſe we truſt in the living God.* In a word then, in this Pſalme the Church bewayles her condition, layes open to God the furious dealing of her adverſaries, prayes to God to helpe and deliver her from this heavie affliction, which her ſinnes had juſtly procured: and for this ſhe had a good ground, as appeareth, 1 *King.*8 46.47. The premiſes conſidered, we may truly conclude, that this Pſalme doth not in the leaſt prove either that perſecution for righteouſneſſe ſake, is *a miſchiefe*, or that the Saints are to pray never to ſuffer. The like may be ſaid of all other places of the like nature.

* See Deu.29. 24,25,32,19. &c. Lam.4.12, 13, &c. divers ſuch like places.

* Deu.28.43.44

* Deut.32.

1 Tim.4.10.

Secondly in that other place (*Pſalm* 122.6.) the Prophet wiſheth men, *to pray for the peace of Ieruſalem*, that is, for the felicity and proſperity of it: and thus much (ſhe yeelding obedience to the voice of God) was promiſed to it, even *peace and proſperity, and riches and honour*, and what not? Great reaſon then, that ſhe ſhould pray for theſe things ſeeing the Lord * commanded her ſo to doe.

* Ezech.36.37

That we are alſo to pray that peace may be within the walls, and proſperity within the Pallaces of the Church of Chriſt, that is, that the Church may be of * *one minde concerning the Truth*, and *live in peace*, and be rather helpefull, than chargeable to others, we deny not; but that by that

* 2 Cor.13.13

place, or any other, the people of God are warranted to pray that they ſhall never be perſecuted for the Truth, I ſee no reaſon, foraſmuch (as wee have ſhewed) it croſſes the whole Current of the New Teſtament concerning perſecution.

Concerning that in the 1 *Timoth.*2.2. The Apoſtle exhorteth, that *prayers be made for Kings*, &c. that is, that the Lord would bring them to the knowledge of the Truth, that they might be as *nurſing Fathers* to the Church, to defend to the utmoſt of their endeavours the faith of the Goſpell, that the Church might have free libertie to practiſe the Rules of Religion in all godlineſſe and honeſty. It was far (as I take it) from the Apoſtles meaning, that the Church ſhould never be perſecuted either by the words or deeds of the Enemies of piety. Nay, he tels *Timothy* that both they and their kings could not avoid perſecution, if they did *live godly in Chriſt Ieſus*: it being *given* (as the ſame * Apoſtle teaches) *to the ſaints not onely to beleeve, but alſo to ſuffer for his ſake*. For any then to imagine, that the Apoſtle commanded them in that place to pray againſt that, which in another place he tells them they could not avoide, what a weake conceit is it?

2 Epiſt.3.12.

* Philip.1.29.

As for that in *Act.*8.3. compared with *cap.*9.31. it proves not that the Saints are to pray never to be perſecuted. What though *Saul perſecuted the Church, and put divers in priſon?* And what though after hee was a friend to the Church, ſhe had reſt and increaſed? Doe this prove it lawfull to pray againſt perſecution, that the Saints ſhall never ſuffer? Nay, in all the time of *Sauls* cruelty, is there any mention made that the Church did pray never to ſuffer? I finde, when the Church was perſecuted, *Act.*4. that ſhe did with one conſent ſeeke to God by prayer, that he would behold the cruelty and threatnings of the wicked, and that they might not be diſcouraged by it, but *ſpeake the Word with boldneſſe*, and ſtill goe on in the wayes of Piety: but that ſhe prayed never to be perſecuted, ſpoken againſt, or reſiſted,

reſiſted, I never finde. And therefore I conclude that it was not the intent of the holy Ghoſt, neither in theſe, or any other Scriptures, to wiſh the Saints to pray againſt perſecution that they ſhall never ſuffer.

Therefore the *Iuſtitiary* is pittifully out, as well in teaching that *perſecution for righteouſneſſe ſake is a miſchiefe to be prayed againſt*, as in affirming that we take *one thing for another*. For the perſecuted, and that in that they are perſecuted for the Truths ſake (as elſewhere is proved) are ſaid to be *bleſſed*, and thereby they are ſure the kingdome of heaven is theirs. Now if the ſlandered, reviled, or perſecuted for righteouſneſſe ſake, are ſaid to be bleſſed; and that becauſe they are ſlandered, reviled, or perſecuted, then ſlanders, revilings, or perſecutions, are bleſſings. And thus much in expreſſe tearmes was proved from *Heb.* 11. 36. unto which place with the reſt alledged by us, he hath not ſpoken one word in anſwere. In that place it is ſaid that *Moſes eſteemed the reproch of Chriſt greater riches than the treaſures of Egipt*. *Moſes* we ſee (as it followeth in that place) counted the reproch for Chriſt, or perſecution for righteouſneſſe ſake a *bleſſing*, a *favour*, or *rich Treaſure*, *Quæ vel omnia Regum terrenorum Diademata facilè exuperat*. And hence it was, (as the former Authour noteth) that *Paul* was uſed to adorne himſelfe with this, as the moſt glorious Title, that he was the * *Priſoner of Ieſus Chriſt*; yea as he proveth from *Gal.* 6. 4. *omnem aliam gloriandi materiam abominatur præter crucem Chriſti*. Theſe things conſidered, 'tis evident, that what I ſpake concerning perſecution is agreeable to the Scriptures.

Imp. Beg p. 66.

Rol. Scot. on this place.

* Epheſ. 3. 1. Philem. 1.

Next whether I am miſtaken in the Martyres, *Heb.* 11. as the *Iuſtitiary* chargeth me, I referre the Reader to what I have ſaid already concerning them.

Imp. Begg. pag. 23. 68.

BVt he returnes to the point and tells us: pag. 45.

Seeing perſecution brings the want of outward things to pray abſolutely againſt all outward wants, and for outward

ward benefits, putting the fault upon impenitencie and Infidelity if wee have them not, is a weake practise, &c.

Reply. WHether it be a weake practise or not, I desire the Reader to waigh well what we have said concerning it, for in this case, though the Saints doe suffer, the promise is not nullified, but is still in force, and fast to the beleever, &c. For the Lord doth never (and 'tis the drift of what we spake hertofore) either deprive his people, of what (according to his promise) he hath given them or keep from them what he hath commanded them to aske, and promised to giue, unlesse by reason of their infidelity and impenitencie, he is (as we say) even forced thereunto.

Impor. Begg. pag. 3, 24.

And therefore, when they are deprived of outward blessings for the Truths sake, wee cannot say propperly that the Lord doth take them from them, but that they are deprived of them (though tis true by the Lords permission) by the hands of wicked and cruell men.

It is wicked men then, not the Lord, that in such cases, takes it from them. Nay, the Lord is angry with such wicked persons, that deprive his servants of those favours which he hath given them.

Neither is their Impenitency or Infidelity the cause of this, but rather wicked mens malice against their obedience and fidelity: for therefore they suffer these things, *because they trust in the living God.*

2 Tim. 2. 12.

May we not now truly affirme, that the Lord doth never deprive his people of outward promised favours, unlesse the cause be in themselves? And may not wicked and ungodly men deprive his people of outward comforts, nay, of life it selfe, and the fault none of theirs? Nay is it not contrary to Gods revealed Will, that men should deale thus with his servants? And is not he himselfe, as it were a patient in it? Forasmuch saith Christ, *as ye have done it to these, ye have done it to me.*

Matth. 25.

Wherefore it is not the same in this (as the *Institutary* affirme

firmes) as it is in other ſtates of afflictions (though tis true, all are bleſſed to the faithfull.)

For firſt, It is not the ſame in reſpect of the cauſe of it; the cauſe of the one being *Impenitency* or *Infidelity*, the cauſe of the other being the *envy and mallice of wicked men againſt them for their Piety and holineſſe.*

Secondly, It is not the ſame in reſpect of the *Author*: For the Lord deprives his people of outward comforts, *for their ſinnes*; and tis the * Devill and his Inſtruments that deprives them of outward comforts for *righteouſnes ſake.* Not that I once imagine that all things are not brought to paſſe (as the Church ∴ acknowledgeth) *by Gods hand and counſell*, but my meaning is, The Lord cannot bee ſaid to be the Author of ſuch wicked actions, for then hee muſt be the perſecutor of his owne people, for obeying the Truth, which is blaſphemy once to imagine. Whether I had good reaſon to ſingle out this from other caſes, and there is (yee ſee) for it good ground in the Scriptures.

* So much hee confeſſeth. pag. 30.
* Revel. 2. 10.
∴ Acts 4.

But whereas he taxeth me for not annexing ſome anſwere *to the inſtanc of Lazarus, and the ſtory of Iob, as making directly againſt my opinion.*

I *anſwere*, Firſt I admire with what face he can taxe me for not mentioning in expreſſe termes one Place cited by him, ſeing he hath paſſed by, without annexing a word in anſwer to ſo many places quoted by me, which ſerue ſo directly to prove what I affirme, as well in defence of what I hold, as to diſprove what hee hath ſaid.

Secondly, I conceived that my anſweres to the other Inſtances, hath ſufficiently anſwered any thing that can bee alledged out of this.

Thirdly, It is but a Parable, and therefore every branch of it is not to be a rule of Faith. The driſt of it (as I take it) is to ſhew the difference betweene the ſtate of wicked men, who are fatted up for *the day of ſlaughter*, and the ſtate of many of Gods ſervants, who are caſt upon many extremities.

And this I am sure (especially seeing the cause of his poverty is not here mentioned) cannot in the least make against us.

As for the story of *Iob*, it was not alledged in the coppy that I received for the prose of his argument; and can he with modesty taxe mee, for not annexing some Answere to it?

Howsoever, thus much I now say concerning it; Those afflictions which *Iob* suffered come within the compasse of persecutions; for the Saints may be persecuted two wayes: Immediately by Satan, or mediately by his Instruments: *Iob* was persecuted Immediately by Satan, as appeareth, *Chap* 1.9.&c. and *Chap.* 2.4.

The cause of this was not especially *Iobs* Impenitency, or Infidelity, but rather his .·. Integrity. And therefore what wee have said in the case of persecution, may be understood of *Iobs* case. .·.Chap.18.2.3

Howsoever *Iob* dared not to manifest such insolency, as the *Iusticiary* seemes to doe; for *Iob* said, *I abhorre my selfe in dust and ashes*, but hee assumes, that he may be deprived of outward comforts (though not in the case of persecution) and yet have no cause to suspect, that there is the least cause in himselfe: Nay he perswades himselfe (and others) that hee hath performed his duty, that hee hath prayed as well as any, that hee had repentance and humiliation enough, and that his love doth abounde, yea hee perswades himselfe, that hee hath faith also in the Promises, and that for his part, hee doth not faile in any particular required in prayer, though he misseth of the thing prayed for: oh horrible impudencie! What? not acknowledg any fayling? can any *Catholike Iusticiary* doe more? It is a marvelous thing indeed, that any professed Christian should dote upon such opinons, or others admire him for them. Chap. 42.6.

But to proceede, Lastly wheras he saies, that I answered in *private conference that those buffetings of Paul*, 2. *Cor.* 12.

7. *was*

7. *was nothing elſe but originall ſinne, againſt which Paul had no warrant to pray, &c.* I anſwere, I remember no ſuch conference, or anſwere made by me. What I ſpake was in publike at his Pariſh, which I ſtill ſtand to make good againſt him, if hee ſhall oppoſe it: but being her ſpoken by the by, I thinke it not meete to ſpeake much concerning it: only thus much I ſay, if his *Buffetings* mentioned *ver.* 7. for which hee beſought the Lord *thrice*, *that it ſhould depart from him*, be all one with his *Infirmities* ſpoken of *ver.* 9. in which he did *moſt gladly glory*, what abſurdity will follow, though it be affirmed that *Paul* had no warrant to pray to have thoſe buffetings quite removed from him?

Nay doth he not (as it were) correct his former deſires and tell vs (upon the anſwere given) that hee was ſo farre from praying againſt thoſe buffetings, as moſt gladly, rather he would glory in them? And if this be granted, will it preve to be againſt the *Sixt Petition of the Lords Prayer*? Is it the drift of that Petition to pray never to bee *tempted*. How then was Chriſts Prayers all heard, ſeeing he himſelfe was *led up of the Spirit to be tempted of the Devill*? or rather doe we not deſire God in that Petition (being tempted) not to give us over, to the violence or power of temptation, and that wee may not be overcome by it? That is, are wee not onely to deſire not to bee vanquiſhed by that, from which wee cannot be free? Matth. 4. 1.

The word *Stuſai* properly ſignifieth to draw out being in.

I will ſay no more concerning this particular, but conclude it with the ſpeech of the Apoſtle, *conſider what I ſay, and the Lord give us vnderſtanding in all things. And that from the firſt*, I paſſe to the examination of the ſecond argument, and its Explication. And thus it followes.

ARGVMENT. II.

*Pag.47. SVch things as are ordinarily denied the beſt and moſt faithfull ſervants of God, and accompany not their condition heere, cannot bee abſolutly prayed for, or expected, neither will that procure them, for that were to croſſe His Providence.

But theſe matters are ſo as is reherſed. Therefore, &c.

Anſw. to his Arguments. pag.37.&c. *Reply.* THis *Argument* is anſwered by denying the *Minor*, the truth of which Inigation, is there plainly cleared, as alſo the inſufficiency of his Inſtances alledged by him to prove it, is evedently ſhewed; what hee hath to ſay againſt it, thus followes.

pag. 50. *Explication.* FIrſt, hee tells us that thoſe *poore, mentioned by St. Iames, are called poore, not becauſe they have not affluence, and abundance, but (as the originall word importeth) ſcarce neceſſaries, without helpe and ſupply from others, which cuts off* (as the *Iuſticiary* conceiveth) *the anſwere given* by me, *holding the poore to be ſuch, as have all things convenient*, &c.

pag.38. *Reply.* FIrſt (as is plainly expreſſed in my anſwere) I take the poore to be ſuch, who have Food, and Rayment, but (as the ſaying is) from hand to mouth, even (like the poore Widow) a little meale in a Barrell, and a little Oyle in a cruſe, ſcarce knowing (when that is ſpent) where to find more out of Faiths ſtore-houſe. Now if our 1.King. 17 *barrell of meale waſteth, and our Oyle faileth*, that is, if wee have not ſo much Food, and Rayment from day to day, (it

(it matters not how God provides it) which * is expedient to ſupport us in live'y-hood, and fitneſſe for our ſeverall imployments, we impute the cauſe to our ſailing, Faith and repentance may helpe that, though not povertie: that is, Faith and repentance may preſerve, and provide ſo much, though not more.

* It is his own expoſition and words pag. 24. So much is promiſed.

Iſſo much be adminiſtred to us, it ſufficeth, and 'tis as much as we are to pray for; As for the way, or meanes by which God is pleaſed to convey it to us, we are not to trouble our ſelves about it, neither is it any diſparagement to Faith and repentance, though God gives it us by the hands of others.

It is all one then, whether God gives it with his owne hand, as he did * *Manna to the Iſraelites, Meate to* * *Eliah*, or *fleſh to* * *Peter*; or whither he gives it by the hands of others, as he did to *Eliah by the hand of the* * *widdow* and to the Church at Ieruſalem, *by the hand of other Chriſtians*, or whether he ſends it by the *Ravens*, as he did to * *Eliah* I ſay it is all one, how, or by what meanes God gives it, and 'tis no leſſe thankfully to be received, whether it come one way or another.

* Exod. 16. 1 King. 19. * Acts 10. 1 King. 17. * 1 King. 17.

The premiſes confidered 'tis plaine, that my anſwer given to his argument is not cut off, by that which the originall word importeth, but ſtrengthened rather: and his other inſtance of *Matth.* 25. to no purpoſe. *ptoeos.*

Next to that demand, if this be granted that many of the Saints ſhall want neceſſaries, what will follow? The *Iuſticiary* anſwers that this will follow, *That temporall neceſſaries doe not neceſſarily accompany the ſtate of the faithfull in this life*, that is (as he explaines himſelfe pag. 52.) *they may often want them.*

To which I ſay, that we freely confeſſe it: The Lord oftentimes depriving them of them, for their unbeliefe, and diſobedience. And indeed the promiſes of temporall neceſſaries, are ſo abſolute (contrarie to this mans conceit) as that (if they beleeve and obey) they muſt needs be performed

to the faithfull, the Lord being most true in the performance of all his promises.

And therefore the Saints of God (the Scriptures alleaged by us are cleare for it) may boldly require them in prayer, and confidently expect them according to the promise; or else the Lord must be unjust if they be not granted, or they wanting in faith or obedience that obtaine them not: which is indeed the point in Controversie, and most substantially proved, both in this and our other Treatise, and consequently our judgement is sound, our practise laudable, and warrantable, on the termes we maintaine it. How simple and groundlesse then, is his excepting against that * passage of ours, *That if any say they have faith, Repentance and Love, and misse of the very thing * faithed in Prayer; the make God a deceiver, because he never gives the one without the other.*

[z] See this in pag. 22.
*He grants himselfe that the Saints cannot misse of the thing faithed in prayer. p. 126.

And thus from his second, I come to his third Argument.

ARGVMENT. III.

pag. 56. THat which did never put any certaine difference betweene one and another in outward things, is not the absolute condition of those things, for that cannot stand.

But Faith and Grace did never put any certaine difference betweene one and another in outward things.

Therefore is not the absolute Condition of those things nor annexed to them.

Answer to his argument. p. 40 *Reply.* THis Argument also is answered as the former, by denying the *Minor*. The places alledged by him for its confirmation are also answered *pag.* 41. *&c.* Now what

what he hath to say against both, is expressed in his explication *pag.* 58, &c. which we intend briefly to examine.

Explication. AND first he sayes, in affirming *that faith and grace doe put no difference betweene one and an other in outward things, his meaning is, no externall difference, that a beleever shall certainely better his outward estate by his faith and grace, &c. So that one may be known from another, &c.*

Reply. FIrst, that a beleever may be knowne from an unbeleever in respect of outward things, I never affirmed and I professe I did not once imagine (as he now turnes it) that he aymed at, or intended any such thing in his *Minor* but rather (as his owne words are) *that there is no certaine bettering of the outward estate by faith and grace*, that is, faith and grace is no certaine meanes to better a mans outward condition, whereupon it was that I denyed his *Minor*. And if faith and grace doe not better a mans outward estate, to what purpose doth our Saviour promise his people a comfortable injoyment of outward comforts upon the *seeking first the Kingdome of God and its righteousnes*? And why do the Psalmist say (a place quoted by him) *the eies of the Lord is on them that feare him*, &c. *to keep them alive in the time of famine*, if the feare of the Lord, and the hoping in his mercy be no means to better a mans outward estate? Nay why do he and others often perswade men to feare God, to obey his commandements, to beleeve his promises, assuring them withall, that it will goe the better with them in respect of outward matters, if neither the feare of God, the obeying his precepts, or the beleeving his promises will better their outward estates? In a word, why doth hee in this Sermon, in expresse termes acknowledge, that such as seeke first Gods Kingdome, that feare his name, and hope in his mercy, *may expect, food, and rayment, and to be kept alive in the time of famine*, if faith and grace cannot better a mans outward estate? I speake this to shew againe the equity of

pag. 58.

Matth. 6.

pag. 9.

the

the deniall of his *Minor*, according as I conceived (and hee before explained) the meaning of it.

But now, (I suppose to hide himself in the mists of falsehood) he denies his former explanation, and turnes his meaning quite another way. Whereupon he inferres divers impertinent passages, quite besides that which I tooke to bee the meaning of his argument, and farre enough off from the answere given to it; And therefore it is not (as I take it requisite to give in any perticular reply to it. As for those things objected, which (as I conceave) come neareſt the point in Controversie I will briefly speake what I conceive concerning them.

Pag. 60. FIrst then to those promises alleaged in our answere, containing blessings belonging to the faithfull and their seed, &c. he answers that *I should have done well withall, to have answered those questions, and resolved those cases, that troubled Iob and his friends, the Prophet Dauid and Ieremy about these matters*, &c.

Reply. HAd I done well if I had answered those questions, and done something, had I resolved those cases? How ill then hath he done, in not taking notise how those questions are allready answered, and those cases resolved?

Concerning the promises we have fully shewed in what cases they are deprived of the things promised. And that is when they are fayling, or when the Devil or his instruments for the Truths sake in case of persecution take it from them. As for the prosperity of the wicked (the case as the *Iustitiary* sayes, that troubled *David* and others) *David* himselfe (upon consideration) resolved the doubt, as appeareth *Psal.* 73. 17, &c. Hee saw their end, and that their standing was slippery, &c.

Thus much also the *Iustitiary* confesseth, for (saith hee pag. 73, &c. *David himselfe was assaulted with this temptation,*

tions, that there was no profit at all to serue God, that is (as before his words are *pag.*58.) *There is no bettering of the outward estate by faith and grace*: but he was satisfied, and resolved to the contrary out of the Word of God.

Now *David* having resolved his owne doubt, I doubt not but *Iob* and *Ieremy* (theirs being all one with his) will be no longer troubled about it.

Well, now these cases being (as before they were) resolved, wee have by the *Iusticiaries* owne confession) done somthing, and neither through ignorance or wilfullnesse passe them by in silence.

Besides, what though God doth not execute presently all his judgements threatned upon wicked men? Doth it therefore follow, that wicked men may safely expect to bee freed from them? May not a King pardon one malefactor, and justly execute another? And may not the Lord execute them upon one, and spare another, and yet be just too? Nay, may he not execute them all vpon all, and yet no just cause given to any, to taxe him with severity (As for the Promises made to to the faithfull, it's farre otherwise, for they being equally made to all, how can it stand with Gods justice to give the things promised to one, and denie them to another, and yet both equally beleeve and obey? It is true, the Lord may, and often times doth) give a favour, a Blessing to his Servants, though they are wauering at his promises, and remisse in obeying his Commandements; herein hee manifests his Mercies, but that he denies his servants, the things hee hath promised, though they keepe and observe the Conditions (that is Faith and Obedience) upon which the Promises were made, is a *paradoxe* to me, and still will bee, vnlesse I can see better ground for it in the Scriptures.

God will ever pay what hee promiseth. See Mat. 20.2. compard with ver. 13. 14.

Next, Whereas hee concludes from these Testimonies of *Iob*, *David* and *Ieremy*, *That faith and grace doth not discouer any certaine difference betweene one and another in outward things to be knowne by*; I answere (as before) we deny it not, neither is it any thing at all to the purpose, but quite besides the former Exposition of his *Minor*, which was, that Faith pag. 64.

and grace doth not better the outward estate, that is, though a man hath faith in the Promises, both for life and godlinesse, yet his outward estate cannot one jot be bettered by it. And how disagreeable this is, to the truth of *Iobs*, *Davids*, an *Ieremies* meaning, hee that runns may reade it.

He speakes falsly. p. 76. in that he saith this was the point controverted.

Let this once serve for all his impertinent discourses, or passages concerning the Saints being knowne by outward administrations, as being besides the matter, and not denied by vs. Let us heare what he sayes further.

pag. 65.

Explication. *CConcerning then those Promises under the law, upon Condition of Obedience, it is evident, that they were part of the Pedagogie of the Jewes, to allure them to be obedient to the Law of God, &c. But under the Gospel, we have a better Covenant, established upon better Promises, yet those promises may bee appendices to the Covenant, and doe most propperly belong unto the faithfull: yet seaing none are perfectly obedient, therefore neither under the Law heretofore, nor now under the Gospel, were those Temporall benefits necessarily conferred upon the Just, but they were deprived of them, and that without breach of promise in God, or want of Faith and grace in his servants.*

Reply. FIrst heere are contradictions (as the saying is) by the dozen. If those Promises under the Law were made upon condition of Obedience to allure them to keepe the Law of God, how will this stand good, that Faith and Obedience will not better their outward estates? For neither * faith and obedience must better their outward estates, or else those promises so made, will prove but poore allurements.

* Faith in Temporall Promises.

Secondly, if because none are perfectly obedient, therefore neither now or heretofore those temporall blessings are conferred upon the Saints, how will this follow, that they are deprived of them, and yet without breach of promise in God, or want a faith and obedience in themselues? Are not these plaine contradictions?

But

But Secondly, that the people of God had those Temporall benefits, conferred upon them, when, and while they obeyed his Commandements, or walked before him (according to the Tenor of the covenant) *with upright and sincere hearts*, Gen. 17. it is evident (as before wee have shewed) by the whole current of the Scriptures: Take that one place more for all; 1. *King.* 8. 56. *Blessed be the Lord that hath given rest unto his People* Israel, *according to all that hee promised, there hath not failed one word of all his good promise, which hee promised by the hand of Moses his servant.*

How plainely now doth the *Iusticiary* contradict the Scriptures? The *Scripture* sayes, that the Lord failed not one word of all his good Promises, but conferred upon his people while they walked before him with a sincere and an upright heart, all the benefits which hee promised them by the hand of *Moses* his servant: The *Iusticiary* sayes, that those Temporall benefits were not conferred upon the people of God, neither could they expect them, although they did walke before the Lord with an upright and perfect heart. Now whether wee are to believe him, or the Scriptures, judge yee.

Thirdly, whereas he affirmes those Temporall promises to be made upon condition of *perfect Obedience*, that is, the Saints must perfectly obey, or else they could not expect the enjoyment of those benefits.

I answere, (howsoever in so saying, he contradicts himselfe) that therein also he is much mistaken: for by *Obedience*, mentioned in *Levit.* *Deut.* and *Isaiah*, and such like, being the condition of those Promises, the Lord doth not intend *perfect Obedience*, that is, a perfect fulfilling of the Law, in thought, word, and deed, a state not obtainable by man in this life, but by *Obedience* he intends a walking before him in sincerity, and with an upright heart, a state obtainable for Gods people, while they are heere. cap. 26. cap. 28. cap. 1.

Thus much is expressly proved in that speech of *Solomon*, 1. *King.* 8. 61. *Let your heart therefore bee perfect with the Lord, your God, to walke in his Statutes, and to keepe his Commandements, as at this day:* Wherein tis expressed, that the heart

of the people of God, at that day was perfect with the Lord, to walke in the pathes of his Commandements. And consequently the perfection or obedience there mentioned (being all one with that in the fore-quoted places) is such a perfection of obedience, that the people of God did, and may obtaine in this life; upon which they did, and still may boldly claime, and confidently expect the benefits promised them upon those termes. Whereupon wee may truly conclude, that those Temporall benefits promised to the people of God under the Law, were ever bestowed upon them, unlesse the fault was in themselues: Neither could the Lord deprive them of them, without breach of promise in himselfe, or want of faith or obedience in them.

But note by the way, that in attributing, the want of outward promised favours, to the *want of faith*, we intend not that faith which the Saints have in Christ Iesus, for the apprehending the pardon of their sinnes, and his righteousnesse whereby they are justified before God, but to the *want of faith* in apprehending such or such a particular outward promise. For we still affirme, that a man may have faith to justifie him before God in Christ, and yet want faith in apprehending an outward promise: To the want of this faith (*I* say) or our fayling in some or one of faithes companions, we impute the want of outward promised favours: as elsewhere wee have more fully shewed. But he proceeds to the Iustification of his instances.

Imp.Begg.pag. 17.75.76.

pag. 69. Explication. MY *instances* (saith he) *produced for the proofe of what I affirme, the Temporary labours to put by with his interpretations, as of* Eccles.9.2. *All things come alike to all*, &c. *Which hee would have to be the iudgement of the World, onely recited by* Solomon, *but not approved off*, &c.

See my Answ. to his Prosop. pag.69,&c. *Reply.* WHat I have written already in answer to his *Prosopopeia*, will serve to be a sufficient Reply to what he hath written here. For first I made it plaine, that it was his interpretation, not *Solomons* meaning, that was according

ding

ding to the judgement of the World: His interpretation being this: *There is no bettering of the outward ſtate by faith and grace*, which I confirmed by that of *Malachy*. cap.3.13.14.

Beſides, did I not plainly ſhew him that he did *little better* then falſifie my writings, and lay a falſe imputation upon them? And did I not alſo wiſh him to take notiſe that an argument framed according to the true intent and meaning of the holy Ghoſt in that place, would not in any meaſure, contradict what I affirmed concerning prayer for outward bleſsing? All this he hath paſſed by in ſilence, as if I had never ſpoken one word concerning it. Neither hath he as yet freed his interpretation of that place of *Eccleſ.* from jumping juſt with the judgement of the world, and all one with the ſpeeches of thoſe in *Malachy*.

They in *Malachy* cryed out with open mouth, *It was in vaine to ſerve God: And what profit is it that we have kept his Ordinances?* The *Juſtitiary* ſayes, *there is no bettering of the outward eſtate by faith and grace, and what profit is it in reſpect of a mans outward eſtate to walke mournefully before the Lord of Hoſts?*

Now what difference is there betweene his interpretation and their ſpeeches? But (it may be) he thinkes to put a difference betweene their ſpeeches, and his interpretation, in that they thought (as he ſuppoſeth) there was no profit here or hereafter to ſerve God: but his meaning is, there is profit hereafter though none here. To which I anſwer, that the ſpeciall cauſe why thoſe men concluded there was no profit to ſerve God, (juſt according to the *Juſtitiaries* words) in reſpect of outward matters, as appeareth in the three former verſes: where the Lord ſpeakes of outward benefits: *Bring* (ſaith he) *all the Tythes into the Store-houſe, and prove me now herewith ſaith the Lord of hoſts, if I will not open you the windowes of heaven*, &c. As if he had ſaid, walke before me with an upright heart, and doe not out of a diſtruſtfull diſpoſition keep backe the Tythes as if I would not provide more for you, but try me herewith, even with your conſcionable obeying my Commandements, and confident depending upon my promiſes, and *ſee whether*

I will not powre you out a bleſsing, and rebuke the devourer for your ſakes, and make you a pleaſant land ſaith the Lord of hoſts? But their words and carriages were ſtout againſt the Lord, in that they ſaid there was no profit in matters of this nature to ſerve God; as if they had ſaid wee have ſerved the Lord, wee have kept his ordinances we have walked mournefully before him, but we finde not our outward eſtates one jot the better. Whereunto the Lord anſwered as *Samuell* to *Saul*, *what meaneth then the bleating of the Sheepe, and the lowing of the Oxen that I heare?*

Why then (if as ye ſay ye have kept my ordinances) have ye *kept backe my Tythes, and not brought them into the Store-houſe?* Certainely if ye had obeyed me, and (as ye vainly imagine) kept my ordinances, I would have opened you the windowes in Heaven, and powred you out a bleſsing, that there ſhould not have beene roome enough to receive it. It is then (as if hee had ſaid) your diſobedience and diſtruſtfullneſſe (though yee ſuppoſe the contrary) *that hath kept theſe good things from you.*

Now whether theſe mens ſpeeches in this of *Malachy*, and the *Iuſticiaries* judgement doe not jumpe together let the wiſe and judicious ſpeake?

pag. 75. NExt he proceeds to make good that other Teſtimony taken from *Mat.* 5. 45. by ſhewing that *outward things doe not difference the good from the bad, ſo that thereby they may be knowne, which hee ſayes is the point controverted, &c.*

Reply. FIrſt, I deny againe that, that was the point controverted, or the meaning of his *Minor* propoſition; but it was this; *that there is no bettering of the outward eſtate, by* * *faith and grace:* And this I am ſure, neither the former nor yet this inſtance prove. That the one is not knowne to bee a Saint, and the other to be a wicked man by outward adminiſtrations, wee have ſtill granted, neither doth it make againſt us.

* i. faith in all the promiſes.

For what though the evill and the good (as the *Iuſticiary* himſelfe

himselfe expounds the meaning of the words) the just and the unjust are equally partakers of the benefits of the Sunne and raine, with other generall effects of Gods goodnesse? will it hence follow, that the just cannot expect the injoyments of such effects of Gods goodnesse? What because God gives of his outward blessings to wicked men, cannot the Saints of God therefore warrantably expect them? And if they are deprived of them is it not because they are failing? This is his reasoning.

In a word then, our Saviour intending in that place, onely to shew, that God out of his bounty gives blessings to all, doth not in the least prove either that the Saints cannot expect outward promised blessings, or that, the cause is in themselves if they have them not, which are the points controverted. *It proves rather they may expect them.*

And thus I conclude (not to trace him further in his wanderings) that the promises of outward necessaries (notwithstanding any thing is said to the contrary) are so absolutely made to the faithfull, as that the Lord must be unjust if he deny them the things promised upon their Prayers, or they wanting in *faith, or saying in some of faithes companions, which is indeed a truth defended by us, and justified by the Scriptures. *In such or such a particular promise.

So I proceed.

ARGVMENT. IIII.

THat which the Lord Iesus and his Apostles did pray for, or against, conditionally, is so to bee done of us, for wee are bid to follow their examples, and to try our Spirits and practises by theirs, and not theirs by ours.

But our Lord and his Apostles did so. Ergo.

Reply. THis Argument also is answered by denying the *Major* proposition; The ground of its denyall is also

alſo laid downe, and the inſtances alledged for the confirmation of it is taken off as alſo the weakeneſſe of the ground of his argument unfolded. What he hath to ſay in defence of his argument, and againſt the anſwere given to it, is contained in his Explication. And thus it followes.

pag. 80. FIrſt (ſaith he) *the argument is grounded upon the examples of Chriſt and the Apoſtles, in a morrall duty; In which caſes we have Commandements given us to follow their ſteps, and to doe as we have them for examples*, &c.

Reply. FIrſt (as in our anſwere is alſo ſhewed) the bare examples of Chriſt and the Apoſtles, though in morrall matters is no ſufficient ground for doctrines of duty, foraſmuch as nothing can make a man owe a duty to God, but a Commandement from God: precepts (as the Scriptures prove) being the true and onely ground of duties. And therefore no man can juſtly be taxed for the neglect of a duty (though hee followes not the example of any) or for ſtriving againſt God, unleſſe he breake a commandement, * *ſinne being onely the tranſgreſſion of the Law.*

Eccleſ. 12. 13. Matth. 28. 20. * 1 Ioh. 3. 4.

Wherefore wee conc'uded, that if any man ſhould teach men to obſerve any thing as a duty, which God hath not commanded, tis beyond his commiſsion, a created worſhip, a worſhip of his owne invention, which God never required, and conſequently, no better then Idolatry.

As for theſe Inſtances, wherein wee are bid to follow their examples, alledged by him for the cõfirmation of the ground of his Argument: I reply (as before I * anſwered) let him quote that Scripture that biddeth, or commandeth us to follow their examples in praying conditionally, that is * doubtfully (as wee take the word, If, in all our Treatiſe) for outward neceſſaries, and wee will lay our hands upon our mouths.

Imp. Beg p. 43. So much is expreſſed. p. 2.

Sure I am (as it followes) Chriſt did checke this kind of praying in *Mark.* 22. 9. but I find not where hee doth command it.

Wee

Wee grant (and ever did) that wherein wee are commanded to follow their steps, wee are bound to doe it, but not because they did it, but because it is commanded, which commandement, not their exampl is the ground of the duty.

Secondly, wee also acknowledg that the examples of the Saints, in things not forbidden, may lawfully be followed; yet there is a great difference (as we have* shewed) between following the examples of the Saints in things not commanded, as things indifferent, and betweene making their examples without any commandement to bee the ground of a duty. In my Answ. to his Prosop. pag. 70.

In the first, wee shew our Christian liberty, it is not forbidden: In the other wee shew voluntary humillity, in creating such a service, which never came into Gods heart to require of us, whence it plainely appeares, how Inveterate the *Iusticiarys* maliee is, as also how shamefully hee doth slander and abuse us, in that heere he affirmes we hold; *That to follow the examples of Christ and his Apostles in morrall duties, yea though wee be commanded to follow them in such things, is a doctrine fit to be spued out of the Church.* The examples are proposed as motives, not as rules.

The doctrine, that I say is more fit to be spued out, then taught in the Church, is this: *That examples without any commandement, is the ground of a duty:* seeing such service is will-worship, and will-worship is Idolatry. Now is will-worship fit to be taught, or cast out of the Church? as I demanded of him in my answere to his *Prosopopeia*, unto which I referre the Reader, where hee may receive good satisfaction concerning this matter. All which the *Iusticiary* passeth over without ever mentioning one passage, or tittle of it. pag. 70.

But thirdly, whereas the *Iusticiary* brings the examples of Christ and his Appostles, not only to prove it lawfull, but an absolute duty for Gods people to pray for outward blessings *conditionally*, that is, *doubtfully*, without certaine assurance to obtaine the very * thing prayed for; I cannot but admire at his Impudency herein. For first was that prayer of Christ which hee made to his Father, a doubtfull prayer? or had hee not certaine assurance to obtaine the very thing prayed for? * This is the maine point controverted as the whole controversie shewes.

How elſe will this example make againſt us? ſeeing the maine thing maintained by us, is, *That neceſſary Temporall Bleſſings ought to be prayed for without doubting, and wavering: And that the Saints may abſolutly expect to receive the things they pray for, &c.* Which to deny (as the *Ieſuiticary* doth in divers places) and heere to bring the example of Chriſt himſelfe to confirme what hee denies (to uſe his owne language) how beaſtly and blaſphemous is it? Next, whereas hee excepts againſt *the ground of my ſpeech, that wee are to live by rules and precepts, and not by examples, affirming that it is vaine.*

See Imp. Beg. p. 3.

pag. 84.

I anſwere, Firſt in ſo ſaying, he ſhewes himſelfe but vaine: for why elſe had hee not anſwered thoſe * Scriptures alledged by me for its confirmation?

* Eccleſ. 12. 13. Matth. 28. 20.

Secondly, he confeſſeth as much himſelfe in his next words, for (ſaith he) *wee are commanded to follow the examples of Chriſt in ſuch and ſuch things*: Now wherein we are commanded to follow Chriſt or his Apoſtles, it is our duty ſo to doe, which Commandement, not their example without the commandement, is the ground of the duty.

What now, is it ſtill vaine to teach, that wee are *to live by rules and precepts*, and not by *examples* without a precept? But that examples are ſufficient grounds of dutys, though the particular wherein examples, are to be followed, is not mentioned in the Commandement, hee endeavours ſtill to make good thus. *The generall command* (ſaith hee) *comprehends all particulars of that nature (that is of * Morrall things) that they need not be mentioned, as I fooliſhly require.*

* So he explaines it before and after.

Reply. WEll, whether it be fooliſhly, or upon a good ground required, I am content to put it to tryall. And in briefe, let that example mentioned in the *Acts* ſpeake for all. *As many* (ſaith the Text) *as were poſſeſſors of lands ſold them, &c, and diſtribution was made to every one according as he had need. And Joſes having land ſold it, &c.*

cap. 4. 34, &c.

Here is an example, and that concerning a Morrall thing: It was the reliefe (wee ſee) of thoſe *brethren*, or poore *Diſciples*

ciples that ſtood in need : It is alſo recommended, and highly commended unto us by *Luke*, the Pen-man of the *Holy-Ghoſt*.

Will not this now (according to the *Inſticiaryes* Indgement) prove a duty for all Chriſtians to follow, for aſmuch as it is comprehended in the generall command? It matters not (if his words be true) though it be not mentioned? And muſt not the *Inſticiary* now (according to his owne doctrine) ſell all that hee hath, or elſe live wilfully in the continuall neglect of a duty? But I am perſwaded, hee will ſay (according to the Proverbe) the caſe is altered, or at leaſt by one tricke or other, ſhift himſelfe from following this example, though (as he ſayes) it is anothers duty. It may be he ſuppoſeth himſelfe to be in ſtead of an *Apoſtle*, and the Example binds not him, but others to ſell all, and lay downe the price at his feete. But whether by this, or ſome other ſhift he will evade it, I know not. I wil waite with patience until I heare his anſwer.

In the meane ſpace, I may truly conclude, that whereas he maketh *Examples without the Authority of any Commandement*, to be the ground of a duty, he doth therein teach *will-worſhip*, which is neither warranted by Scripture, nor backt with reaſon.

As for the Holy Scriptures, recommending unto us the examples of the *Patriarks*, *the Prophets*, *the Martyres*, *as patternes for our imitation*, *to follow them*, it is to ſtirre us up to bee ready, and willing to yeeld obedience to the commands of God, as they did, whether in ſuffetings for his Trueth, or beleeving his promiſes, or obeying any other Commandement; and not barely of themſelues, without any Commandement, to be our rules; And therefore he doth moſt vilely ſlander us in ſaying, I reject *the examples of Chriſt, and his Apoſtles*. I reject not any example commended to us in the Scriptures, though I deny them of themſelues to be our rules.

Secondly, hee no leſſe ſlanders me, in ſaying, *pag. 86, I condemne all (or any) of the Churches of Chriſt, for not imitating thoſe patternes of the Apoſtles, and their examples in*

those times, as he pretends, I have else-where alledged. Howsoever let the Reader here obserue, that the *Iusticiary*, together with all those Churches, which he speakes of, doe live (by his owne doctrine) in the continuall neglect of their duties, in that they doe not Imitate those first patternes of the *Apostles*, and their examples in those times,

Oh therefore (to use his owne words) how rude is this man, to reject the Examples of Christ himselfe, and his Apostles, with such contempt as he doth? But he proceeds, and shewes what hee can say against my Answere to his Proofes.

pag. 90. Explication. *HOw suspitiously and dangerously doth the Temporary handle this prayer, as if it were some unadvised speech, and full of the humanity, out of which the Devinity recovered him againe. For the defence whereof, he would make one Evangelist to contradict another, and citeth a nameless Author saying, that it was* Nequaquam iusta precatio, &c.

Reply. THat I neither handle this Prayer of Christ *suspitiously, or dangerously* (as the *Iusticiary* chargeth me) is evedent by what I have spoken concerning it. First I said, put case wee granted that our Saviour, and his Apostles did pray as he said, yet, yet wee deny that their Examples in that particular ought to be our rule.

Secondly, I spake what I conceived, and withall set downe the judgements of others concerning it. That which I spake was to shew, how the meaning of the two *Evangelists* did agree together, though there might be (at least in appearance to some) some shew of difference; in that the one brings in our Saviour praying with an *If*, the other without an *If*. I say the substance of what I spake, was to shew how the *Evangelists* meaning was both as one, which I made appeare, in that the Greeke word *Ei* (translated *If*) in that of *Luke*, is taken in the Scriptures sometimes for, *forasmuch as*, and then the words of *Luke* runne thus: *Father, forasmuch as thou art willing*,

willing, let this Cup paſſe from me, and this is directly agreeable with the words of *Marke, Abba, father, all things are poſsible, let this Cup paſſe from me.* Mark. 14.36.

Now that the word *Ei,* rendred (*If*) is taken alſo in the Scriptures for, *foraſmuch as,* it is cleare, by that in the *Canticles If thou know not,* i. (as Maſter *Ainſworth* noteth upon the place) *Foraſmuch as,* or *ſeeing thou know not, &c.* It is taken alſo after the ſame manner in the booke of Numbers: *If the men be come to call thee,* i. *Foraſmuch as* * *they are come, &c.* By this it is plaine, Firſt that the words of the *Evangeliſts,* by what I have ſpoken, is made to be both as one. How ſhamefully then doth the *Iuſtitiary* abuſe me in ſaying (as he doth *pag.*90.) that for the defence of my opinion, I make one Evangeliſt to contradict another? Secondly, it is evident, that it was farre from our Saviours intent (as the *Iuſtitiaries* words import) by this his Example to teach his ſervants to pray *conditionally,* that is to doubt when they pray whether they ſhall obtaine the very thing, God commanded them to aske, and promiſed to give: Nay, is there any ſhew of ground, for us once to imagine, that Chriſt would by his Example teach his people to doe that, which hee expreſly condemned in another? That he did expreſly condemne this kind of praying 'tis cleare, by that of *Mark.*9.22.23. *If thou canſt doe any thing* (ſaith the father of the poſſeſſed child) *have compaſsion on us and helpe us. Ieſus ſaid unto him, if thou canſt beleeve, all things are poſsible to him that beleeveth,* Whence 'tis cleare, without Controverſie, that Chriſt condemned this doubtfull (*If*) and gave the man to underſtand, that it muſt be removed (hee muſt beleeve) if hee expected to finde any helpe or aſsiſtance from him. cap.22.20. * They were there, as tis verſe 19. cap.1.8.

How now can the *Iuſtitiary* juſtly taxe, or ſuſpect mee for handling this prayer of Chriſt *ſuſpiciouſly,* ſeeing I have ſo expounded it, as it doth well agree with other Scriptures? Nay rather, how dangerouſly doth he handle it, ſeeing he affirmes, our Saviour did that in a matter of *Morrall obedience,* which before he condemnes; and by his example bindes us to practiſe, what by his expreſſe words he diſliked in others. Is not

this good ſtuffe, and like to hang together?

Secondly, I related the judgements of ſome others, concerning this Prayer of our Saviour: And firſt I ſet downe what *Calvine* thought concerning it, which was, that it was not a premeditated prayer, *ſed vis & impetus, &c.* the force and violence of griefe, did extort from him thoſe words.

Next I mentioned this ſpeech of another, *It was nothing then the complaint of a minde toyling and diſtreſſed (ex nequaquam juſta precatio fuit, etſi oratio vera fuit,) out of a juſt forme of praying, although it might be true prayer.* And what difference is there betweene this ſpeech, and that of *Calvine*? *Calvine* ſaies, it was not a premeditated prayer, *ſed vis & impetus, &c.* And the other doth but ſay, it was nothing but the complaint of a minde toyling and diſtreſſed, *et Nequaquam juſta precatio* &c a though it might bee true prayer.

Howſoever the ſpeciall cauſe, why I cited thoſe *Authors*, was to ſhew that he dealt very unadviſedly to fetch in an *If*, into the fourth *Petition* of the *Lords Prayer*, from thoſe words of Chriſt ſpoken at ſuch a time, the true meaning whereof many writers ſcarce dare venture to determine. Beſides, that of Chriſt is rather to be referred to the ſixt *Petition*, he fighteth with *Temptations*. Whereupon I demanded of him, if he thruſt an *if*, into the ſixth, why not alſo into the fift? And then (as I told him) it would proove all popery.

Compare this with what I have written in my other booke, pag. 43. 44. & 70.

As for the judgement of *Gualter* produced by the *Iuſticiary* as ſufficient in his eſtimation to end the Controverſie, I anſwer, it makes not ſoe much againſt us as he conceives. For firſt we confeſſe we are to pray as Chriſt hath taught us. *Thy will be done in earth as it is in heavenly.* Secondly, concerning ſuch things of this life, wherein the Lord hath not revealed to us in his word, what he would have to be done, we are not to trouble the Lord, or our ſelves about them. Thirdly, wee alſo teach that ſuch are to bold, as will undertake to preſcribe unto God, what they will have to be done for them. Theſe are the ſpeciall things *Gualter* ſtands upon.

Now if he meane any further, as namely, that we are not to pray in faith for outward promiſed favours, or that wee may not

not urge God with his own promiſes; or the asking no more but what he hath commanded, is too much boldneſſe, and that this is to preſcribe God what we would have to bee done for us, I cannot receive his Teſtimony no though an Angell from Heaven did ſecond him, unleſſe I can ſee better ground (then yet I ſee) for it in the Scriptures, and yet (I hope) herein I manifeſt no unreaſonableneſſe.

Next concerning what hee hath ſaid in anſwer to what I ſpake concerning that of *Rom.* 1.10. I briefly reply: Firſt, what I ſpake concerning *Pauls* deſire of going to *Rome*, was ſpoken *ex conceſſo*, namly that he had no promiſe of going to *Rome*; and therefore it was no marvaile (that being granted) though he did put in an *If*, or doubt of injoying the thing deſired. But whereas he ſuppoſeth he hath gotten ſuch advantage from this ſpeech, *That the Apoſtle prayed for that, for which hee had no promiſe*, and conſequently ſinned, &c. I anſwer, why may not a man thinke or ſay, that *Paul* might poſsibly pray to goe to *Rome*, though he had no promiſe, as well as *Moſes* prayed to goe into the Land of *Canaan*, though the Lord expreſſely told him he ſhould not goe thither? Secondly, why may not *Paul* bee taxed for not ſending faith with a prayer for ſome temporall thing, as well as *Moſes* was taxed for want of faith in a Temporall promiſe? Though *Moſes* and the Apoſtles were holy men, and the deare ſervants of God, yet they were not without ſinne: for did not *Moſes* ſometimes *ſpeake unadviſedly with his lips?* and *Paul* often doe *The thing that he loathed?* What need the *Juſticiary* then make ſuch a doe, although I had in plaine termes (upon the former ground) ſaid that the Apoſtle had ſinned? eſpecially ſeeing he freely confeſſeth, that the * *evill which he would not, that he did*, and that he was a man *ſubject to like* * *weakneſſe with other men*?

Pag. 94, &c.

Deut. 3.25. 26.

Numb. 20. 12.

Pſal. 106. 32.

* Rom. 7.

* Act. 14. 15.

But whereas the *Juſticiary* demands, *what if the Apoſtle had a promiſe from God and a particular aſſurance of his coming to the Romans?* I anſwer, that will quite overthrow his argument grounded upon *Pauls* example, forasmuch as it will prove directly: Firſt, that *Pauls* prayer was not *conditionall*, that is, *doubtfull*, but *abſolute*, ſeeing hee had a particular aſſurance

rance, of the very thing petitioned, which was his comming to them. For how could the Apoſtle doubt or queſtion, whether it was the will of God, or not, that hee ſhould ſee the *Romanes*, ſeeing hee had (by the *Iuſticiarys* owne confeſſion) a particular aſſurance of his comming to them? Nay, he muſt needes know it was Gods will, that he ſhould goe to *Rome*, or elſe it was impoſſible he ſhonld have a particular aſſurance of his comming thither. How then his owne words overthrowes his Argument, he that hath but halfe an eye, may cleerely ſee it.

Concerning thoſe places (*Acts* 23.11. & 19.21.) alledged to prove that *Paul* had both a *promiſe and aſſurance alſo of comming to Rome*: I anſwer, it is true, but that promiſe was fullfilled long before the writing of this Epiſtle, as appeareth by the ſtory. Firſt, in the 21. Chapter is declared his journey to *Ieruſalem*, and the abuſes which hee ſuffered there. In 23. chapter, verſe 11. the Lord comforted him in the priſon, and told him, that he muſt beare *witneſſe alſo of him in Rome.* Now after the Lord made this promiſe to *Paul*, hee was ſtill a * Priſoner (as the other Chapters ſhew) untill hee came to *Rome*, chap. 28. where hee continued certaine yeares verſ. 30. *preaching the Kingdome of God:* In which time hee converted divers to the faith, and eſtabliſhed a Church there.

* See his own words, c. 28. 17

Not long after hee departed thence and came to *Corinth*, from whence he wrote this his Epiſtle to the *Romans*, wherin he manifeſts his * *deſire to come to them againe.* Now I demand of the *Iuſticiary* where any promiſe is expreſſed, that *Paul* ſhould goe to the *Romanes* the ſecond time? But put caſe it be granted he had a promiſe, becauſe when hee wrote the Epiſtle, he was (as 'tis confeſſed) confident in it, cap. 15.24. It ſhewes but my miſtake in that particular, but no way makes againſt, but directly for the point defended by us. For if the Apoſtle was certaine that hee ſhould goe to *Rome*, it ſhewes, he was ſure it was Gods will, and conſequently his Prayer was abſolute, and hee aſſured of the very particular hee prayed for, which being granted, the Controverſie is ended.

* Cap. 15.23.

But

But where he taxeth me for teaching prowdly, because I teach men to say, *give me this, &c.* hee shewes either abundance of ignorance, or horrible impudence; for is this to teach prowdly, to teach men to pray (according to Christs owne words) *give us this day, our daily bread*? Doubtlesse (to use his owne words) it argues not a little arrogancie in this man, to quarrell so with the words of our Saviour, teaching us to pray, *give us this day, our daily bread*? May he not as well alter, or adde to the Fifth *Petition*, and say, If it be thy will *forgive us our sinnes*? And so make it all popery? pag.100.

Next he indeavors to prove those words of *James* to bee a rule for all to follow in praying for Temporall Necessaries: And first hee sayes, Saint *James in these words intended the reproofe of the arrogant confidence, and groundlesse security of such, as if their lives and actions had beene in their owne power, &c.* cap.4.15. pag.102.

Reply. WEll, be it so, doth it therfore follow, that a man must doubt whether it be the will of God, or not, to give us such necessaries which he hath commanded us to aske, and promised to give? or because Saint *James* sayes, *for that ye ought to say* (concerning things not revealed) as whether wee shall live a day) *If the Lord will wee shall live, &c.* Must wee therefore question things revealed? as if the Lord would manifest such or such a thing to be his will, and *James* would have us question, whether it was his will.

Heere the *Iusticiary* to delude the Reader, useth a piece of his *Sophistry*, by which he doth no lesse then abuse the meaning of the Apostle, Saint *James* speakes only of things secret, and therefore presumption for us to determine of it: Hee includes things revealed, & what greater abuse of the Apostles meaning? The thing that he should prove, is this: *That tho' the Lord doth make a promise to any of his people, as* he did to *Paul*. Acts.23.11, *that he shall live to goe to such or such a place to witnesse his Truth, or doe this or that*, yet the intent of *James* is to reprove such a man, nay *Paul* himselfe, if hee

ſhall ſay (though God hath promiſed it) I am ſure to goe to ſuch a place, and I am confident through Chriſt that ſtrengtheneth mee, that I ſhall doe this or that; and this I am ſure he can never prove.

Concerning matters of that nature, ſpoken of by Saint *James*, wee confeſſe wee are to ſay as hee teacheth, *If the Lord will*; or (as *Pauls* words are) *If the Lord permit*, wee will doe this or that: As for inſtance, If the Lord will, to morrow we will goe to ſuch a place, or if the Lord permit, we will ſee ſuch a friend, &c. And ſurely (as elſe-where is expreſſed) ſuch may be juſtly reproved, and condemned for vaine boaſters, who ſhall refuſe ſo to ſay, or thinke the contrary.

* Act. 18. 21. 1. Cor. 4. 19.

See the Anſw. to his Argument. p. 45.

Pag. 106.

Next he wiſheth mee *to take notice of my ignorance, and raſhneſse together, in that I ground my opinion of abſolute prayer upon the revealed word of God, excluding his ſecret counſell and purpoſe altogether*, &c.

Reply. FIrſt, hee might have done well to have taken notice of his owne ignorance, and raſhneſſe, in that hee would have all our prayers to be guided by Gods *ſecret will*, which belongs not to us to meddle with. And how can any one tell, either how, or for what to pray, or how to judge of his prayers, or of the event of them, by that will of God, whereof hee is ignorant? Search the Scriptures, they are they only (as containing all things needfull for us to know) that we muſt looke unto: In them is revealed who have right to pray, and to whom the promiſes both of life, and godlines belong. By them, I ſay, alone, muſt wee be guided. As for his *ſecret will*, it belongs not to us to meddle with. And therefore for the meanes, or way, how, and in what manner, the Lord will bring ſuch, or ſuch a thing to paſſe, or beſtow upon us ſuch or ſuch a bleſsing, which hee hath promiſed, wee are not to trouble our ſelues about it; but according to *Moſes* counſell, wee *are to ſtand* ſtill, and behold the ſalvation of God*, even wholy commit that to his Providence. And therefore the *Inſticiary* might well have ſpared his long diſcourſe about

* Deut. 29. 29.

* Exod. 14. 13.

about ſubmitting our wills to Gods ſecret will, *i.* to his guidance concerning matters of this nature, it being (ye ſee) not denied by us.

Beſides, doth not a man as well ſubmit to * Gods revealed will, when he prayes only for what hee hath commanded him to aske, and expect to receive onely what particular God hath promiſed to give; as well as hee doth ſubmit to Gods ſecret will, when he ſaith concerning any ſecret thing, *If the Lord will*, I ſhall live to doe it. Nay, doth not the *Iuſticiary* himſelfe in plaine words expreſſe as much? For (ſaith hee) *Paul doubted not of the revealed will of God, for the lawfulneſſe of his deſire to goe to Rome*; Neither did *James queſtion the lawfulneſſe of travelling to Cities, and Townes for commerce and gaine; but it was concerning ſecrets that they did interpoſe that Condition, If the Lord will, or if God permit.*

* Can our Prayers bee made with greater ſubmiſsion to Gods will, then when they are made according to his word.

Which conſideration, we readily doe, and ever * did acknowledge concerning our determining upon ſecrets, or things not revealed: As for example, when we reſolue to goe to ſuch a place, or to ſee ſuch a friend and the like, wee are to ſay, we intend, *if the Lord permit*, to come to morrow, either to ſee you, or to doe ſuch a thing for you, &c.

* Anſw. to his Arg. p. 45.

And this wee confeſſe is an *If* of ſubmiſsion, and conſequently they are to be condemned for *vaine boaſters*, who ſhall refuſe it, ſeeing they know not whether they ſhall live an houre. But that it is the intent of the Holy-Ghoſt in that of *James*, or any other place, that wee ought to uſe an *If*, in praying for any particular favour, which God hath expreſly commanded us to aske, and promiſed to give, wee doe not, neither can wee acknowledge, becauſe an *If* in ſuch a caſe, is not an *If* of *ſubmiſsion*, but of * *doubt* and *diſtruſtfulneſſe*. Imp. Begg. p. 2.

And indeede, how is it poſsible that the *Iuſticiary*, or any other can ſay when hee prayes; *Oh Father, if it be thy will, give me ſuch a bleſsing which thou haſt promiſed to give me*, and yet not * doubt whether he ſhall have it, yea or no? And therefore all that hee hath ſaid concerning the word *If* how it is to be uſed about ſecrets, or things not revealed, might well have beene ſpared, and all his ſpeeches and groundleſſe affir-

* Mark. 9. 22, 23

mations, that the word *If* is to be uſed in ſuch prayers which wee make for Temporall promiſed bleſsings, is no other then the froth of imagination, and the vaniſhing vapour of errour: And the contrary, no preſumptuous kind of praying, nor yet the charging them that miſſe of the thing promiſed, ſo asked, with vnbeleife, or fayling in ſome, or one of Faiths companions, an unwarantable kind of cenſuring. And thus of the Fourth Argument.

ARGVMENT. V.

IF the Faith of Miracles was limmited and bounded by the will of GOD, then all other Faith is ſo: But the Faith of Miracles was confined to the Will of GOD, and His pleaſure, *ergo*.

Anſw. to his Argu. pag. 47. *Reply.* THis Argument is thus anſwered, if by the will of God, you underſtand his revealed will, wee deny not but that the faith of Miracles is bounded by the will of God, revealed in the Scriptures, &c. But if you bound Faith with Gods ſecret will, we deny your whole Argument, &c. Now what is ſaid againſt this, thus followes.

pag. 119. *Explication.* THe Faith of Miracles, and all other faith is bounded with Gods ſecret will, which if it were not, then this conſequence muſt follow: that all muſt be healed, and all rayſed, ſeeing the Promiſes are abſolute, &c.

Reply. HOw contrary to the whole current of the Scriptures it is, that Faith is grounded upon, or bounded with the ſecret will of God only, it is evident enough. For faith only hath relation to ſome promiſe, ſome contract, ſome covenant, and that expreſſed in the Scriptures; And that promiſe is our evidence, and upon that promiſe is our Faith grounded, and with it is bounded. wee expect that, and that only which he hath promiſed, and therefore faith *Peter*, *Wee according to his promiſe, looke for new heavens*, &c.

* Epiſt. 3. 13.

Wee

We are to looke for nothing but what is according to his promise, and what he hath promised we ought to expect.

To any promise that * is pretended and not deducted from his Scriptures, he may justly plead, *Non est factum*; He made no such promise. To any promise that hee hath made in his Word, he is faithfull in its performance, for (saith the Apostle) *He is faithfull that promiseth.* To make then the secret Will of God the ground of our faith in any thing, is to make the ground of our faith a very uncertaine thing; forasmuch as we are uncertaine what the secret Will of the Lord is: neither are we (which shewes the absurdity of the *Justitiarys* judgement) once to enquire into the ground of our faith, it being (as he vainely imagineth) Gods secret Will: for to search into his secret Will, is meere curiosity, and directly forbidden. To make Gods secret will the bound of our faith, is to leave faith (at least in respect of our knowledge) boundlesse, forasmuch as we cannot tell, when by Gods secret Will, our faith is bounded; or at least we shall never know what, or when, wee are to beleeve. The premises considered, may wee not safely conclude, *that all our faith have no other ground or bound but the promises revealed in the Scriptures*? But then saith the adversary, this absurdity will follow, *That all must be healed, and all must be raysed, &c.*

* In respect of Gods secret Will.

Heb. 10. 23.

To which I answer, that in curing diseases, or working miracles two things are required: First, faith in the parties upon whom the miracle is to bee wrought, or diseases cured. Secondly, faith in the party working the miracle, or curing the disease. That faith ordinarily is required in the parties upon whom the miracle is to be wrought, is evident by these speeches of our Saviour, *according to thy faith be it unto thee*, and againe, * *if thou canst beleeve*, and * *beleevest thou that I can doe this?* and such like speeches. Hence it was that it is said of our Saviour (in whom there is neither want of power or Will) *that* * *hee did not many mighty workes there, because of their unbeliefe.* The infidelity of Christs Countrimen kept him from working many miracles among them.

* Mark. 9. 23. See Act. 14. 8. 9

* Math. 13. 58.

Secondly, that faith is allwaies required in the partie work-

ing miracles, or curing diſeaſes, is alſo evident; *Verely, Verely,* (ſaith * Chriſt) *I ſay unto you, he that beleeveth on me, the works* Ioh.14.12. *that I doe, ſhall he doe, and greater works than theſe ſhall he doe, becauſe I goe unto the Father.* And againe, *if ye have faith yee* Luk.17.6. *ſhall ſay to this Sicamore Tree,* &c. Hence it was, that ſometimes the Diſciples themſelves could not doe ſome miracle, or cure ſome diſeaſes, and that becauſe they wanted faith to doe it. Point blanke to this purpoſe, is that mentioned by *Matthew, chap.17.29. Then came the Diſciples to Ieſus apart* (being troubled that they could not cure a childe poſſeſſed of a Devill) *and ſaid unto him, why could not we caſt him out? And Ieſus ſaid unto them* (verſ.20.) *becauſe of your unbeliefe.* Now though it be true, that the Apoſtles had promiſes for working miracles, and curing diſeaſes, yet they could neither worke miracles, or cure diſeaſes, unleſſe by faith they apprehended thoſe promiſes.

What was the cauſe then, put caſe it be granted (as the *Inſtitiary* would have it) that *Paul prayed for Trophimus his health, and could not recover it; though it be promiſed that the prayer of faith ſhall ſave the ſicke?* Heare what our Saviour himſelfe ſaith, It was *becauſe of his * unbeleefe.*

* Matth.17.19 How weake a conſequence then is this mentioned by the *Inſtitiary*? For firſt, divers might bee ſicke that rejected the Apoſtles, and the reſt (unto whom the gift of healing was given) together with their doctrine, and ſo deprive themſelves of thoſe favours, by reaſon of their diſobedience and unbeliefe, Matth.13.58. as Chriſt Country-men did. Others againe might deſire to be made partakers of thoſe favours, and yet with the man lying at the Poole of *Bethesdah* want an oportunity to bee healed. And laſtly others could not be cured of ſome diſeaſes (as Chriſt teſtifieth) by reaſon of the unbeliefe of thoſe that were to cure them. But where the people received the Apoſtles Doctrine, and beleeved, the Apoſtles being ſtrong in the faith of the Lord Ieſus; all that came to them, yea, if they could come but ſo neare, as to have the *ſhadow of Peter to overſhadow them* they were * *healed* every one.

* Act.5.15.16. Hence then it is evident (and tis to be noted) that the people

ple where the Apoſtles came were healed of all their diſeaſes, unleſſe (the fault being in themſelves) they wanted faith to be healed, or the Apoſtles not ſo ſtrong in faith as they ſhould be. And this is all we labour to perſwade men unto, even to ſee their owne weakeneſſe, and freely to confeſſe when they are deprived of any promiſed favour, that they have made themſelves unworthy of it by reaſon of their unbeliefe, or their failing in ſome other particular. But this the *Iuſtitiary* will not by any meanes be brought to acknowledge, but proudly affirmes that if the Lord either take from him; ſuch a favour which according to his promiſe he hath given him, and keepe from him any bleſſing (though he prayes for it) which he hath expreſly promiſed to give him, yet it is not becauſe hee is fayling in the leaſt. And to this purpoſe tend all his *arguments*, together with what he hath ſaid in this his *explication* of them Is not this a *Iuſtitiary?*

There is no other cauſe mentioned in the New Teſtament.

I find expreſſed in the Scriptures, when God takes, or keeps from his people any promiſed bleſſing, the cauſe is imputed to the *want of faith*, or their fayling in ſome or one of *faiths companions*: I finde alſo the people of God readily and willingly confeſſing the * ſame, and ſaying with *David, thou art juſt in ſpeaking, and cleare in judging.* But this man ſteps in and denyes all this, affirming, that it is but the *froth of imagination, and the vaniſhing vapour of errour.* Wherein (to pay him his owne money againe) I cannot but admire at the rudeneſſe of his Spirit and language, that to free himſelfe, and others from juſtly deſerved blame, doth contradict, and reject the expreſſe Word of God with ſuch ſpeeches. Neither is it any marvaile, if he vilifie others writings with his foule language, that dares thus to handle the holy Scriptures.

* Numb.20.12
Deut.29.24.
1 King.9.9
Ierem.22.8.
Matth.13.58.
* Lam.4.12,13.
1.18.
Pſal,51

If it be demanded what ground he hath for his ſpeeches, he hath nothing to anſwere but this, *It is comprehended in the ſecret will of God.* God in his Word hath told us, that the cauſe why he takes from us many bleſſings which he hath given us, is our iniquities, and why hee with-holds many good things from us, is our ſinnes: And this man affirmes it is no ſuch matter, forasmuch as Gods revealed Will (as he teacheth) is

Ier.5.25.

no

no ſufficient warrant; but by his ſecret Will wee are to judge our ſelves, and others in matters of this nature, *proh ſcelus!*

And here I wiſh the *Iuſticiary* would take notice of his notable ignorance, and raſhneſſe together, who in grounding his opinion for *Conditionall Prayer*, and to prove, that the fault is not to be imputed to our ſelves, if we obtaine not at the hands of God what outward favours hee hath commanded us to aske, and promiſed to give, hath reference to the *ſecret Will of God*, which we are not to meddle with; excluding his revealed Will, by which we are only to be guided, and by which we muſt know when we are to be blamed, and when not. For although Gods ſecret purpoſes muſt ſtand, neither can his ſecret decrees be altered; yet we are to thinke, ſpeake, doe, and judge, according to his revealed Will recorded in the Scriptures.

Pſal. 33. 11.

And therefore when God by his revealed Will in any particular doth condemne us, it is impious for any man, under pretence of ſome underſtanding he hath in Gods ſecret Will to acquit us. And yet this is the onely ground of the *Iuſtiti-ari's* arguments, and all he hath to ſay in defence of what hee holds. Which I wiſh the Reader well to ponder.

Anſw. to his argum. p. 48. 71

Now concerning what he hath ſaid againſt my ſpeeches about *Pauls* praying for *Trophimus*, I referre the Reader to what I have ſpoken concerning it, both in my anſwer to his *argument*, as alſo to his *Proſopopeia*, compared with that which I have ſaid in this *Reply*. Onely thus much here, whereas he demands, *whether I would not thinke it much to be ſo taxed, to be with a Chriſtian in his ſickneſſe, to have need of his health, yet not ſo much as to offer up a Prayer unto God for him, but there to leave him?* affirming it was no *Chriſtian carriage ſo to doe, &c.*

I anſwer, for mine owne part, when wee are to pray for the health of any Chriſtian friend, there are ſome things ſeriouſly to be waighed, and well to be conſidered off: Firſt, it muſt be inquired into, or in ſome meaſure made knowne unto us, whether the ſicke party (as * *Paul* ſpeaketh) *have faith to be healed?*

* Act. 14. 9.

healed? Secondly, I ſhould ſeriouſly examine whether the Lord hath given me faith to beleeve and apprehend the promiſe, which if I found upon good ground, I ſhould be willing to performe my duty, and labour of love towards him in that particular: but to pray for his health, if I was not perſwaded, I had faith to beleeve, I ſhould obtaine it, I ſhould ſcarce dare adventure, and yet I doubt not but it would prove no leſſe then a chriſtian carriage. But if we did joyne together, and pray for his health, and yet hee was not recovered; the Scriptures hath taught me to yeeld (let others ſay what they will) that it was becauſe of our unbeliefe, or our fayling in ſome, or one of faiths compannions: God I am ſure is faithfull; but wee are weake and unbeleeving. Whence then I conclude, that the prayers which wee offer up to God for ſuch things which hee hath expreſly commanded us to aske, and promiſed to give, are to be made in faith, without the *Conditionall If*, expreſſed, or implyed, and that if wee miſſe of ſuch things, the fault (and that juſtly) is to be imputed to our fayling.

Wee are to pray for no more but what wee are perſwaded wee doe beleeve.

In ſuch caſes, it is an *If* of unbeliefe, and not of ſubmiſsion.

And thus have I fortified my anſwere to his arguments, and vindicated the Truth of what I teach concerning prayer for outward promiſed bleſsings, which the *Iuſticiary* ſo ſcornfully and weeakly oppoſeth, not paſsing by (to my knowledge) any particular alledged by him, without giving a plaine anſwere to it, which (I hope) will ſufficiently ſatisfie the Conſciences of divers concerning the Point.

Next in order, I ſhould proceede to ſpeake ſomthing of a Queſtion or two added and reſolved by the *Iuſticiary*, concerning the point. But before I ſpeake of that, I thinke it not amiſſe to diſcover a notable tricke of his, to eſcape the anſwering of the principall poſitions, and chiefe places of Scripture alledged in my Booke, for the defence of what I hold; It is thus.

And thus (ſaith hee) *have I fortified my five Arguments, which the Temporary ſo ſcornefully oppoſeth, not tracting, nor following therein his rambling diſcourſes, and wandering* Pag. 124.

Reply. FIrſt if the *Iuſticiary* could avoide with credit the anſwering of thoſe maine Points and principall matters in my Booke by ſuch a ſhift, he might well (as the ſaying is) clap his hands, and ſay my wit hath ſaved me. But that the Reader may judge whether thoſe things which hee hath not anſwered one word unto, be rambling diſcourſes, and wandring impertinences; I will ſpecifie (omitting divers others) ſome few of them.

Firſt, pag. 2. I give him to underſtand, that the ground of what I hold concerning Prayer for outward Neceſſaries, is the Lords Prayer, where Chriſt commandeth his Diſciples to pray for things neceſſary, without any *If* at all. And if the word *If* bee *imployed* in the Fourth Petition, then it muſt needs be, that ſomwhat to Chriſts forme is wanting, and that the forme of Chriſt is not perfect, &c.

Secondly, pag. 7. I have compriſed all the matter concerning prayer for neceſſary bleſsings into three heads: Firſt, that prayer for ſuch bleſsings muſt be made in faith. Secondly, that the Saints may, and ought abſolutly depend upon God for their daily bread, as for the pardon of ſinnes. Thirdly, that the cauſe is in themſelues, who doe not obtaine them. And for the confirmation of each of theſe, I have alledged expreſſe places of Scripture.

Thirdly, I have ſhewed, pag. 10. that five things are required in Prayer, and withall, I have ſhewed by expreſſe texts of Scripture, that the wanting, or fayling in ſome, or one of theſe Five particulars, is the cauſe why the Lord doth not give us the things prayed for.

Fourthly, I proved alſo, pag. 16. that Chriſt himſelfe did expreſly condemne praying with an *If*, *Mark.* 9. 22.

Fiftly, I affirmed alſo, pag. 25. that the word *If* was never placed in the Lords Prayer, by Chriſts appointment, and therefore there is no roome for him, and though a man put him in, Chriſt will roote him out.

Sixtly. In anſwering his Arguments, I have produced divers

divers Scriptures directly against his affirmations.

Lastly, I have shewed in my answere to his *Prosopopeia*, how in diuers particulars, hee hath most grosly abused my writings, and perverted the true meaning of them.

These particulars (and divers others) the *Iusticiary* hath passed by, without giving (for ought that I can finde) any word in answere to them. Why, if he had meant plainely, and desired truly to satisfie the Consciences of any, had hee not answered directly to these things, and by Scripture taken them off? But alas he hath a tricke (and as hee supposeth a clenly one too) to put all this by: These, and the like (saith he) *are rambling discourses, and wandring impertinences.* Is not this a pithy answere? But to leave it to the judgement of the prudent, I returne to that question or two, added or resolved by him: and thus it is.

Question. *IF any aske, how then shall wee pray in Faith for any outward things, if it bee uncertaine, whether wee shall have them?* pag. 126.

Answere. *HEE answeres: Wee beleeve, that wee shall have what is good for us, &c.*

Objection. *VVEE may pray absolutely for things necessary, as we may to doe the will of God, seeing such things conduce thereunto.*

Solution. *THe will of God is done, and his name glorified, as well by our Passive, as by our Active obedience, &c.*

To these questiions, the *Iusticiary* sayes, I have not given a word of resolution, but deny the conclusion, retorting the words upon himselfe, and so leave it.

Reply. HIs Arguments being proved to be of no validitie, I made no question, but that the force of whatsoever

ever was contained in theſe queſtions, and anſweres, was alſo removed: And therefore, though hee be a good ſcholler, yet belike he ſcarce knowes the premiſes from the concluſion.

But let us a little more punctually examine his anſwere to the queſtions. *Wee beleeve* (ſaith hee) *that wee ſhall have whatſoever is good for us*, &c. Here is an anſwere (as hee intends it) that will helpe, or cure all diſeaſes: whatſoever lawfull requeſt any make to God, although he be deprived of it, (it matters not for what cauſe) if wee can but beleeve it is good for us to miſſe of it, It ſalues up all. If this be ſufficient, why did *Ezechiah* take it ſo grievous, when the Prophet told him, he ſhould *dye*, before he had obtained of the Lord according to his promiſe, a *Sonne to ſit upon his Throne*? This anſwere it ſeemes could not ſatisfie his Conſcience. Hee perſwaded himſelfe (an that upon a good ground) that nothing could be better for him, then that which God had promiſed to give him: admiring with himſelfe, how it could be, that God ſhould deprive him of what he had promiſed, ſeing (it being the thing that God required of him) *hee walked before him with a perfect heart.*

Secondly, the Holy Ghoſt doth not intend, when the Saints pray for this, or that favour which God hath promiſed to give them, that the *Object* of their Faith ſhould be any other then the very particular thing promiſed: *Beleeveſt thou* (ſaith Chriſt) *that I can doe this*? and againe, *If thou beleeveſt*. Now what were they in theſe and the like Promiſes to beleeve? or what was the *object* of their faith? Certainely the very thing they asked, as appeareth by the text,

Thirdly, That the Lord doth give his Servants what is *good for them* I deny not, which may be taken (as the *Iuſtitiary* underſtands it, though in a divers reſpect) two wayes: *Poſitively*, or *Privatively*. Firſt, *Poſitively*, when we have the very benefits themſelves in particular, that we deſire, as the two blind men had their *eyes opened*, *Matth.* 20. and the Centurion had his ſervant cured. *Matthew* 8. And ſurely all ſuch things which Gods ſervants receives from his hands according to his promiſe muſt needs be good for them, ſeeing thereby God manifeſts.

The Saints never queſtioned this.

nifests unto them *that he is at peace with them*, and that *they regard not evill in their hearts.*

Secondly, *Privatively*, when the thing desired (though commanded to be asked, and promised to be given) is denied us as the *Israelites* were denyed their requests, though they cryed long and often, and *Moses* was denied an entrance into *Canaan*, though he sought it diligently, and *Iosuah* at first was beaten off, and smitten by the men of *Ai* though God promised to deliver it into his hand, and divers such like examples. And that it was good for them to bee denyed these promised blessings, we readily grant, because the Lord in so doing, gave them to understand, that all was not well, and by it, he would have them take notice, either of their unbeliefe or rebellion, which kept them from the injoyment of those favours. Zach. 7. and divers such like places.

Here then lies the difference betweene us: when the *Iustitiary* affirmes, that such promised favours, are *not good for us* he intends thereby to free us from the least * suspition, that the cause is in our selves that we are deprived of them: But when we say, to be deprived of such promised favours *is good for us*, our meaning is, because God by such denialls, shew us (as hee did *Ioshuah*) that we have sinned, and he intends in so doing to bring us to repentance. *It is the only thing he laboured to prove in all his book.

And to speake truly, if the Lord should grant their requests, and fulfill their desires, by giving them such, or such a favour, and yet they regard evill in their hearts, he would thereby lull them a sleepe in *Security*, and cause them to conclude that their way was *perfect before the Lord*, when it was no such matter. Hence it is when his owne people rebell against him, that God like a loving Father deprives them of promised favours, and *covers himselfe in a Cloud, that their prayers shall not passe through*, and all because they should take notise, that he is displeased with some of their courses. The injoyment of the very particular, which God hath commanded his people to aske and promised to give is allwaies good for them, unlesse by their unbeliefe and disobedience they make it otherwise. See more of this in my answer to his Prosop. pag. 62.

Neither doth that inſtance of *Abraham* (alleaged by the *Iuſticiary*) make in the leaſt againſt what wee have here ſpoken: For firſt his intending to make *Eleazer of Damaſcus his heire* was before the Lord had made any promiſe unto him that his heire ſhould come out of his owne bowells, as appeareth verſ. 3, 4. He never intended it afterwards, neither did he ever queſtion, but that a ſonne of his owne ſhould bee his heire; for he *beleeved in the Lord, verſe 6*. Nay, did *Abraham* ever queſtion, whether it would bee beſt for him, to have a ſonne of his owne, according to the *promiſe*, or to have another to be his *heire*? yet unto this tends the *Iuſtitiary's* ſpeeches, otherwiſe all he ſayes is as nothing.

Gen. 15.

Secondly, that he prayed that *Iſmaell might be his heire* (as he affirmes) cannot be gathered from the text, neither is there any colourable ſhew for it: 1. It is plaine in the Text that the Lord promiſed him a ſonne by * *Sarah*, and that ſhe ſhould be the *Mother of Nations, and that Kings of people ſhould come of her*; The conſideration whereof, rejoyced *Abrahams* old heart exceedingly, as appeareth *Gen.* 17. 17. Now is there any reaſon for a man to imagin, that *Abraham* prayed to God that *Iſmaell* ſhould be his *heire*, ſeeing hee ſo much deſired and rejoyced to have a ſon by his old wife, who was ſo faire, ſo neare, and ſo deare unto him? It is not likely: eſpecially ſeeing God did not promiſe that he ſhould be his heire. Neither yet will *Abrahams* words beare it; All he ſayes is this; *Oh that * Iſmael might live before thee*. As if he had ſaid, although thou wilt be ſo gratious unto me as to give me a ſonne by *Sarah*, yet forget not *Iſmaell*, I pray thee but bleſſe him alſo. And to this well agrees the anſwer which God made unto him, *ver. 20. Behold I have bleſſed him, and will make him fruitfull, &c.* That which *Abraham* deſired for his ſonne (as may bee gathered by the Text) was gratiouſly granted to him.

* Gen. 17. 16.

*ver. 18.

Thus much God promiſed to his mother.

But if it was as the *Iuſtitiary* would have it, I cannot ſee how it can make againſt our, or for his cauſe: forasmuch as our point is concerning ſuch particulars as God hath *promiſed to give us*: And therefore, unleſſe hee prove that God promiſed that *Iſmaell* ſhould be his heire, and upon his prayer denied

nied what he had thus promiſed, but gave him an *Iſack* to bee his heire. I ſay, unleſſe he makes this good, all his words are but vaine, and they will quickly vaniſh. The ſame may be ſa.d of all inſtances of the ſame nature. As for that of *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 12. we have already ſpoken concerning it, which ſhewes plainly (being compared with this before going) that it makes nothing againſt us.

Concerning his ſecond objection, and reſolution, this is that which I ſay to it: I confeſſe *the Will of God is done, and is Name glorified, as well by our paſsive, as by our active obedience, in ſuffering quietly his pleaſure and will*: my meaning is, when any of Gods people doe goe aſtray, and compell him to lay his hand of affliction on them, either by depriving them of ſome promiſed favour, or by laying upon them ſome threatned judgement, *God's will*, yea, *his revealed will is done*, who hath ſaid, he will deale ſo and ſo with them, if they diſobey him. Secondly, his Name is *glorified*, for thereby hee manifeſts his hatred againſt ſinne, his love to his ſervants, in correcting them going aſtray, and his juſtice in executing judgement: Yea *his revealed will is done* when we patiently and quietly ſuffer his pleaſure and will, in correcting us for our faults, forasmuch as in his word he hath ſhewed, it is his will we ſhould doe ſo: And *what glory is it* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *if when wee are buffeted for our faults, we take it patiently?* And ſecondly, his Name is glorified, when we ſhall yeeld obedience to his Commandement. Now becauſe Gods will is done, and his Name glorifidd by our ſuffering patiently his afflictions, yet it will not therefore follow, that God either laies upon us any affliction which our ſinnes doe not cauſe; or that we may not abſolutely pray to have the affliction removed, ſeeing God upon our repentance hath promiſed the ſame, and that the cauſe is not in our ſelves if ſuch afflictions be not removed. 1 Pet. 2. 20.

Neither will it hence follow, that herein wee ſet up mans wiſedome, above the Wiſedome of God, and our wils above his Will: for in ſo doing we make not our owne choyſe, as we think good, nor confine the Lord by our prayers, but ſeek that which he hath allotted to us, and told us 'tis his Will

that

that we ſhould aske. We know and beleeve, *quod utile eſt agroto magis novit medicus quam agrotus.* But put caſe the *Phyſitian* preſcribes potions for his *Patient*, and tells him it is good for him, doth the Patient breake rule, or is hee his owne chooſer, if he deſires it? or doth he better to queſtion whether it be *good for him*? This is our caſe, God who knoweth what is good for us, hath preſcribed in his Word our potions wiſhing us withall to ſeeke it of him, and promiſing upon our ſeeking to give it us; Are we now our owne *chooſers*, and are our Prayers *Peremtory*, if wee aske it of him? or doe wee better to queſtion, whether it be *good for us*, or at leaſt doubt whether wee ſhall have it upon our asking? If not, then it muſt follow, *That ſuch things are abſolutly to be asked without doubting, and the cauſe ſtill in our ſelues, if wee doe not obtaine them*, and conſequently, the *promiſes* of outward neceſſaries ſo to be underſtood, as wee have alledged. And thus have I done with his Fift Argument. Hee proceeds, and produceth certaine *Teſtimonies* (as he ſaith) *to give ſatisfaction, as a ſixt Argument.* And firſt *it appeares* (ſaith he) *to be the Doctrine of the Church of England in the Homilies, and the Booke of Common prayer, &c.*

pag. 137.

Anſw. To which *I* returne this briefe anſwer: First I utterly deny his * *Argument*, for although it bee true that ſo much is affirmed in the booke of *Homilies*, and the Booke of *Common Prayer, &c.* yet it will not follow, that therefore it is ſo, unleſſe the *Iuſtitiary* doth take the *Homilies* and the booke of *Common Prayer*, and would have others alſo take them, for a ſufficient ground to build their faith upon. Secondly, I marvaile he would alleage the *Homilies* and the Booke of *Common Prayer* (as an Argument) to juſtifie what hee holds concerning prayer, eſpecially ſeeing in former times, hee hath ſo much diſclaimed thoſe bookes, as containing groſſe errours, and foule abſurdities. Why may not the Authours of thoſe bookes erre in this particular, as well (at leaſt in his judgement) as they doe in divers others? Are thoſe Bookes a ſufficient Argument in one thing, and not in another? Is hee not driven to a great ſtraight that hee muſt flie to the Booke of *Homilies*

* He produceth it as an Argument.

Homilies and *Common Prayer* for ſhelter? Thirdly, concerning all thoſe *Teſtimonies* alleaged by him, it were no hard taske to produce divers ſpeeches out of them, that makes directly againſt what he affirmes, and plainly for our cauſe. Firſt in the Booke of Common Prayer all thoſe particulars which God hath commanded us to aske, and promiſed to give, as deliverance from *Plague, Peſtilence, and Famine*, &c. are asked without an *If*, and if we are deprived of theſe or the like temporall promiſed favours, it is *becauſe of our ſinnes*, which the *Iuſticiary* will not upon any termes acknowledge.

As for thoſe other *Authours*, they ſpeake in other places of their writings, directly for what we affirme, and therefore unleſſe the *Iuſtitiary* can reconcile their ſpeeches, he will bring them in, to contradict themſelues.

First concerning the nature of Prayer, *Bucan* defines it thus *Prayer is an ardent affection, tending unto God whereby we aske and looke for, onely from God in Chriſt things belonging to Soule and body; ſecundum ipſius mandatum & promiſſiones, according to that which hee hath commanded us to aske, and promiſed to give.* And therefore he ſayes in another place, *Non qualibet ſed a Deo promiſſa & mandata*, &c. We are not to pray for any thing, but onely ſuch things which he hath commanded us to aske, and promiſed to give, even according to his Will *verbo ipſius nobis patefactum*, made knowne unto us in his Scriptures. Thirdly, concerning the qualifications required in prayer, he ſets downe divers: among the reſt he names *Faith* and *Repentance*. And what doth all this tend unto, but to prove? Firſt, *that all our prayers muſt be made in faith.* Secondly, *that we are to aske, and beleeve to receive thoſe outward favors which he hath commanded to aske and promiſed to give.* And thirdly, If we ſend not along with our prayers faith and Repentance, and the reſt required in prayer, *we cannot thinke to receive the things which we pray for.* Thus *Bucan.*

This was expreſſed in my other booke p. 5.

Next concerning *Calvine* and *Gualter*, we have cited ſome of their ſpeeches alſo, tending directly to prove the maine thing I ſtand for. As for Doctor *Preſton*, he ſets downe in the *Saints daylie Exerciſe*, divers qualifications required in that

pag. 16.

pag. 102, &c.

prayer that ſhall bee accepted. Firſt, *the perſon muſt be right.* The ſecond thing required, *is faith.* The third is *fervency.* The fourth is *Humility.* The fifth is *to ſanctifie the Lord in our hearts.* Hee makes the wanting, or fayling in theſe or any of theſe to be the cauſes, why we receive not at the hands of God what we aske. His words are theſe: *Yea, my beloved, the ſaints themſelves, when they ſinne againſt God, as you heard heretofore, they are ſuſpended from the Covenant, though they be within the Covenant, yet they are ſuſpended from receiving the benefit by it, that otherwiſe they might have,* &c. Nay, in that very Page quoted by the *Juſtitiary*, he freely confeſſeth; *That where there is a particular promiſe for any thing, we are bound to beleeve in particular,* &c. Now then if the promiſe of food, or rayment, &c, be in particular (as who can deny it?) promiſed to euery true beleever then every true beleever (& that by the Ds. judgmēt is bound to beleeve in particular. This & much more in D. *Preſton.* The like may be gathered out of thoſe other *Authours* alleaged by him. Now let the *Juſticiary* reconcile theſe places, and ſhew how he can make all ſtand, or agree together.

pag. 128.

Howſoever *humane Teſtimonies* is no good ground to build upon: wherefore though it bee granted (as hee ſpeaketh) that what he affirmes concerning prayer, hath beene *generally received and taught amongſt them,* yet that will not prove that wee are bound to beleeve it. Say not then it is the judgement of this *Father,* or of that *Counſell,* or the *Doctrine* of this *Church,* the command of that *King,* or the long continued *Cuſtome* of theſe times, and ſo reſt ſatisfied, but *trie it all* (as *Iohns* Counſell is) by the true Touchſtone, Gods Word, *Num ex Deo ſit?* Whether it be from Heaven, or from men? For it is vaine, nay abominable to plead any of theſe, when the Word of God is againſt it, *quaſi conſuetudo* (as *Gualter* noteth) *major ſit veritate* as if cuſtome, or any other thing, was of more force or credit, then Gods written verities? And thus this ſixth *Argument* grounded upon *humane teſtimonies* appeares to be of no force to ſatisfie any good conſcience concerning the particulars before mentioned.

1. Epiſt. 4. 1

Hom. 1 Epiſt. Iohn.

Next whereas hee affirmes that what I hold concerning prayer

pag. 144.

prayer for outward blessings, is an *uncouth opinion, and that I walke in a solitary way to defend it, having none to beare me company but a few favourites of mine owne,* &c.

I answer first that I goe not alone, 'tis plaine, forasmuch as every maine point that I have laid downe, is confirmed by expresse Testimonies of Scripture, and not onely so, but inlarged (for the most part) with the speeches of other writers, as the Reader may see in my Booke.

Secondly to prove that I goe not alone, it was no hard task to shew divers others, who in their writings and speeches, maintaine as much as I teach as before I have shewed. I will set downe one more for all. Master *Culverwell* in his Treatise of Faith concerning earthly blessings (unto which Doctor *Sibs*, and Doctor *Gouge* both subscribed unto and highly commended) compleatly confirmes the manie points laid downe and defended by me in my booke. See both their Epistles, before the book.

In that Treatise hee hath laid open (as Doctor *Sibs* his words are) *the veines of the promises to the view of every Christian*, especially those outward promises, which God hath made to his people of all that is needfull in this World. These promises are ranked by him into two companies. First *generall* Secondly, *speciall promises*, all which (as hee assures us by the word of God) *belong to every one of Gods people*, and all these he perswades us to beleeve, and in particular to apply to our selves, affirming withall (in expresse termes *pag.* 481.) that *the speciall cause why so few reape the benefit of them, is through the want of faith*; *For* (saith he) *all desire these, and many know that such things are promised in the Scriptures; but either they doubt they doe not belong unto them, as being none of Gods Children (who be the only heires of all the promises) or if they bee of this number, yet either forget the Consolation offered, or through distrust doe not apply them to their present necessities, and so languish in their extremities without comfort.* So there. Againe in answere to some objections made against what hee spake concerning faith in these promises, hee also speaketh thus: *What I spake* (saith hee) *of Gods bounty in providing meanes, whereby his Children might live more comfortably, if the fault* Answ. to object. pag. 45.

was not in themselues, &c. Thus also there. This I am sure is the summe or substance of what I hold, and what is defended in my Booke; by which tis plaine, that I goe not alone, but have others to beare me company, besides such (as he sayes) are my favourites, unlesse hee calls all such my favourites, as have from time to time written, and spoken for it.

pag. 146. In the next place the *Iusticiary* repeateth certaine passages of mine, affirming withall, there are many the like in this discourse. Whereunto he giveth this learned and judicious answere: *They are not worth the rehearsall, being full of gall and folly.* The weight of which answere I leave to the judgement of the wise. And so passe to the last part, his exceptions against a *Distinction*, which I have laid downe; The distinction is this.

Wee are to distinguish Faith into two sorts: The one is called Justifying, or Eternall Faith, and so called, because the Object it eyeth, is of an eternall nature, it apprehendeth Eternall Promises. The other is called Temporary Faith, and so called, because the Object it eyeth, is some Temporall thing, &c. To which the Adversary answeres; first that I have *coyned a distinction, never heard of in this sence*, &c. Secondly, that I *apply, and in a manner confine that saying, The Just shall live by Faith, To outward things, which the Apostle useth and applyeth, Only to Justification and Salvation*, &c.

* Answ. to his Protop. p. 75. *Reply.* TO which I reply, First, that this is not a *coyned distinction*, but warranted by the Word, it is sufficiently manifested in my other * Booke, to which I referre the Reader.

Besides, doth not the Scriptures in divers places speake of a Faith, that apprehends only some *Temporall Promises*? May wee not fitly then call that a *Temporary Faith*, in respect of the *Object* it eyeth, which is any Temporall Promise? Put case it be granted, that * Faith which lasteth but for a time, is called *Temporary* yet I question not (let the indifferent speak) but that it may fitly be called *Temporary* also, in respect of its *Object*, which is some *Temporall* thing; Nay, is it not more

* It is not faith indeede, but a seeming faith.

proper-

propperly ſo called in this laſt reſpect? And is not there better ground for it in the Scriptures; then for the former? It is a true faith, or faith indeede which apprehendeth *Temporall* Promiſes, and therefore may it not in that reſpect be fitly called *Temporary*? But I find not any Faith (that is true faith) which the Scripture affirmes, laſteth but for a time, and then, how can faith in that reſpect, bee fitly, or properly called *Temporary*.

As for our Saviour's ſtiling ſome *Proskairoi*, *Temporaries*, doth he not rather intend their profeſsion, then Faith? and ſo call them *Temporary Profeſsors*, not *Temporary beleevers*? eſpecially ſeeing Christ in that very verſe tells us, that thoſe profeſſors *had no root in themſelues*, i. their Profeſſion did not ſpring from the roote of Faith, and therefore they were but *Proskairoi*, even *Temporary Profeſsors*: Their profeſsion vaniſhed when *Tribulation aroſe*. Beleeving taken for profeſsion.

Secondly, I doe not miſapply this ſaying, *The juſt ſhall live by Faith*, but I apply it according as the meaning of the Holy Ghoſt will beare, which is not by annexing it (as the *Juſticiary* faineth) to that branch of Temporalls, by way of *Antithiſis*, but by it, to give all to know, that the people of God are as well to *live by Faith*, in reſpect of the things of this life as the life to come: And thus tis applyed by the Prophet *Habbak.* and the *Author* to the *Heb.* as is very cleere by the coherence of both places. And thus doth Mr. *Culverwell* apply it in his *Treatiſe* of Faith, as is expreſly mentioned both in the *Title*, & other places of his Booke. And therefore I ſee no reaſon to the contrary, but I may ſtill bee confident, and conclude (as before I did) in this manner: *So now you ſee (notwithſtanding your great ſtirre) the diſtinction being grounded upon the Word of God, remaineth unmoveable.* cap. 2. 4. Heb. 10. 37.

Laſtly, wheras he ſayes, *That he beares much ſlander, and reproach from mee, being foule and injurious in language*: I Anſwere, Let him but ſhew any particular wherein I have abuſed, or wronged him in word or deed, I profeſſe I will endeavour to give him full ſatisfaction.

Whatſoever I have taxed him withall, I have ſufficiently

proved: And I am ſure, that is neither *reproach*, nor *ſlander*, but a manifeſtation that he juſtly deſerved blame. I would hee would as willingly confeſſe it, as he doth plainly ſee it. Howſoever (to uſe his owne words) *I wiſh him more Modeſtie and humilitie, and then* (no doubt) *hee would bee more Orthodoxe, according to the promiſe;* * *The meeke will he guide in judgement, the meeke will he teach his way.*

* Pſal. 25. 9.

And thus have I againe vindicated the Truth of what I hold concerning Prayer for outward neceſſaries, and plainly ſhewed, That whoſoever ſhall ground his Prayer upon faith, and his Faith upon Gods Word, asking only what God commands, and beleeving to receive only what hee hath promited to give, ſending along with his Prayers, thoſe quallifications required in the Word, hee may bee (none elſe can be) ſure, that he Prayes *according to Gods Will*, and *that his Prayers ſhall not bein vaine.*

BRITISH 15 MY 1906 MUSEUM

FINIS.

Errata.

PAge 23. in the marg. for *ſiuſai* reade *ruſai*, p. 25. in the mar. for *ptoocós* reade *ptookos*, p. 3. l. 26. for *neither* reade *either*, p. 33. l. 28. for *in reſpect* reade *was in reſpect*, p. 35. l. 13. for *is in themſelves* reade *is not in themſelves*, p. 36. l. 3. for *untolded* reade *unfolded*, p. 36. l. 17. for *ſtriving* reade *ſinning*.